*Volume XLII*] *January, 1937* [*Number 2*

# The American Historical Review

## THE HISTORIAN'S PART IN A CHANGING WORLD

PROBABLY never since this Association was founded have men and women of our profession been asking themselves as earnestly and as anxiously as they are asking now, the old question, so often asked before, whether we, as historians, have anything practical to offer to our own country and to the world in times of crisis like the present, and if we have, how we can make our particular contribution most effectively.

Each one's answer to these pressing questions must be his own personal answer, based on his own individual experience, if it is to be anything vital to him or any practical help to others. But if this is true, each one must also see that his answer can never be more than a tentative one. He must realize how very narrow the range of his vision must be; how infinitely small a part of the whole varied experience of our race, which is history, can be mastered in one short span of life or even in many. All history should be a lesson in humility to us historians, but there is no more striking lesson than the present world crisis, in many of its most important aspects wholly unpredicted, if not unpredictable, even at the opening of this twentieth century.

To one in a boat at sea the horizon seems to recede into infinity on every side, but if he is a seaman, he knows he is only looking over the brim into nothingness.

In a troubled time like our own, in thinking of our inherited institutions and ideas, one sometimes feels as old Thomas Fuller did in 1655 on the completion of his *Church History of Britain,* when, as he says in his preface, "An ingenious Gentleman some moneths since in Jest-earnest advised me to make hast with my History, for fear (saith he) lest the Church of England be ended before the History thereof."

In this period of perplexity, we naturally wonder what service history can render in solving the problems of our country and of the world. We are asking ourselves how we, as historians, can do our part and what that part may be. No words seem more aptly to express this mood or to make clear our own present doubts and fears and hopes than the

moving preface of an English pamphleteer of 1643 who signed himself "An Earnest desirer of his Countrie's Peace":

> When a Patient lies sicke under the destroying paroxismes of a Fever, every stander-by will be telling his Medicine, though he be no Physitian: O then let no Sonne of this State account it presumption in me, for putting in my judgement, and speaking that which I conceive might, if not remove, yet mitigate this fatall distemperature of our common Mother: at another time perhaps it might be censurable, but in this exigence laudable.

For whether we like to admit it or not, we know we are to a large degree the creatures of habit, and the makers of history are no exception; they always have been and always will be guided in their actions rightly or wrongly by what they conceive to be the results of past experience, by the "lessons of history"; at least they will attempt to justify these actions or to secure popular assent to them by an appeal to the past. "It is these lessons of history that we want", I once heard it said by an eminent professor of pedagogy, and we do want them; but I was glad it was pedagogy and not history he professed, for he added that it was only the lessons, not the history, that we needed. In the schools, two or three weeks, he thought, would be enough for the history itself. This certainly is "to make haste with our history", and perhaps it is this very widespread unthinking haste of today that best indicates the most helpful contribution we can make as students of history. Some "lessons of history" we know will always be drawn, some "lessons of history" will always be acted on. Our part is to see that these really are the lessons *of history*.

It is not as easy a part as it might seem at first sight. Especially in times like this we are in a hurry lest the institutions we study "be ended before the History thereof". We are anxious—too anxious—to find a short cut.

In this connection we are often told that each generation will rewrite its history of the past. Even if it does not wholly reconstruct this past, it will make its own choice of the parts to be noted, and these parts will be precisely those which are uppermost at the time when the history is written. One scarcely needs to be told that this is so, but some have told us more. They have not only admitted the fact that this is done. They have said it ought to be done. At times they have implied, if they have not actually said, that what is out-of-date now ought to be eliminated from history. Others have put it a little differently, perhaps a little less crudely. It is humanly impossible, they say, even to approximate in our words the complex of innumerable facts and forces that made the life of

any part of the past. The historian at most can make only a selection, and a woefully inadequate one at the best. This is too true, though one might question whether it is any more true of some parts of the past than of the actual present.

But again these defeatists, for they are defeatists, would tell us more. Because it can never be done perfectly, it should not be attempted at all. At times they seem even to make a merit of our obvious, but unfortunate, defects. Why not admit that all our histories are after all little better than fiction, little more than impressionistic pictures? And isn't it better so? The writing of history, they tell us, is only an "act of faith". One convincing proof of the inadequacy of this phrase of an eminent predecessor on this rostrum is the tale of his own distinguished contributions to history.

Styles change in history as they do in women's garments, but sometimes the latter revert too. When some of us were youngsters we were taught to look up to the aims and aspirations of Leopold von Ranke as a guide. Now this is all changed. We find ourselves as professed historians engulfed in the general wave of pessimism, economic, political, and intellectual, which has been sweeping over the world since the Great War. Because we now know we can never achieve the full objectivity which Ranke preached, we are told that we should never make an effort to do so. Let us rest content with the subjective. It is all we can ever reach, all that can have any truth or value for us. Objective truth is a chimera. History is only an "act of faith". This intellectual weariness is no new thing in the world. Plato spent his life in combating it among the Sophists. Today the world is again in a sophistic mood—I am using the word, of course, without any modern sinister meaning. There is a general distrust of reason. Behaviorists would have us believe that blind animal instinct alone determines human destiny, and fervid nationalists are setting up the menace of a particular tribal culture against the historical verdicts of universal human reason. Such subjectivism usually ends in a complete skepticism. As Gorgias said in the Socratic dialogue, even if there were an objective truth, we could never recognize it. History is a vain quest. Let us frankly admit that we are only drawing imaginary portraits and vistas that never were on sea or land. No doubt it is a good thing thus to know our own limitations. In the past, without question, we have known too many things that were not so, and we shall never know more than a little of what is so. Some distrust of ourselves is not a bad thing. As one result, we shall probably

be spared some further excursions into prophecy under the name of the "philosophy of history".

But with all due deference to the considerations just recited, the historian is after all faced with the brutal fact that some things did actually happen in the past, and that some record of these happenings sometimes survives. And if these things happened, they had definite historical causes and results of which we often have some account remaining, even if incomplete.

How, in common sense, dare anyone say that we can know absolutely nothing positive about these past transactions, even if we cannot know all, even if we can know but little? And why should we be content merely to tint our picture with the colors that suit the changing taste of our own time? I am impressed by the sober words of the late Professor Tout in the opening part of his great work on English medieval administrative institutions. They seem to reflect more of the general aims and purposes of Ranke than of some later ones. "We investigate the past," he says, "not to deduce practical political lessons, but to find out what really happened."

We may not agree unreservedly with the first half of this sentence, but what serious historian can question the second? And if we investigate the past "to find out what really happened", knowing all the time that we can never truly find out anything whatsoever, why should we waste our time? Why not turn at once to historical romance? Too much of our written history even now is actually historical romance, and there may be a danger that much more will be. Biography seems to be turning that way, and already there are more than hints in certain parts of the world that all past history must be rewritten for a present purpose. In these days of propaganda, propagandist history is not likely to be neglected. Just let me give you a short extract from one interesting older example of it.

The author, John Aylmer, later bishop of London, is particularly bitter against the French—the date of the book, 1559, is significant—and asks "Are they Giaunts, are they conquerours, or monarks of the world? No good Englishe men they be effeminate Frenchmen: Stoute in bragge, but nothing in dede. . . . They be your slaves and tributaries." They are in fear of the English, he says, "and it is no marvaile, for we have thorow Gods help ever had the better of them. . . . When durst these meacockes mete us in the field? or if they did: went they not weepynge awaye? . . . . We have a fewe hunting termes and pedlars

French in the lousye lawe, brought in by the Normanes, yet remayning: But the language and customes bee Englyshe and Saxonyshe." "We live in paradise. England is the paradise and not Italy, as commonly they call it." And here in the margin the author has added, "God is English"!

You laugh, but how much more fantastic is this than some things written or taught or promoted in our own time? If such is the rewriting of one's history for his own generation—or his own nation—then some of us may prefer, with Professor Tout, to stick to the more humdrum task of trying "to find out what really happened", even if we know in advance that we can never find it all out. And few serious students of the history of English institutions, I think, would venture to deny that this more patient method in Professor Tout's own hands has actually resulted in a truly measurable increase in our positive knowledge of "what really happened".

There is, of course, a sense in which each generation not only does, but undoubtedly should, rewrite past history for itself. For example, no one could deny that our modern concern in the material things of life—whether that itself be good or bad—has led to an appreciation of their importance in the past, fuller and probably more just than the views of some of the older historians. But when this leads, as it sometimes does, to a treatment of some past periods on the assumption that these same material or economic factors must have been just as prominent then as they are now in the political or intellectual development of the time—when this is done, we get in the name of history a distortion in place of an interpretation.

When kept within proper limits, this general kind of revision has, it is true, resulted in a very great enrichment of our history; but it is a mistake to think of it as the only kind; indeed, it is the principal contention of this paper that the most valuable of the newer interpretations of that history are now to be found in a quarter not only different from this, but almost directly opposite to it. The most serious defects in our existing histories of past institutions—the kind of histories with which I am most familiar—lie, not in any undue suppression of modern modes of thought and action, but rather in their untimely intrusion. Thus the chief advances made in the recent study of these institutional developments have come from a recognition of such defects. And I venture to predict with some confidence that any further improvement we may ever be able to make over our predecessors in this study in the years to come, any firm building we may succeed in erecting on the foundations they

have laid, is likely to be in large part the result of a still clearer recognition of these defects and of a still further application to history of the canon which Sir Edward Coke once laid down for law: *contemporanea expositio fortissima est.*

Infractions of this rule naturally come oftener in some kinds of history than in others and are far more frequent for certain periods. For contemporary or recent history the danger is slight, for there familiarity with present-day conditions forms the necessary basis of all accurate historical judgments; and even in ancient history the faults are likely to be of a very different kind. You will notice that most of the illustrations of our retrogressive modernism come from the institutional development of the Middle Ages and after. This is the period from which we can trace our own familiar institutions in a continuous development. It is the stage of growth immediately behind us, in which were laid the foundations on which our social and political fabric still stands. Thus it is just because these institutions are so peculiarly our own and yet during their earlier growth so fundamentally different in character from what they have now become, that the temptation is so great to slur over the historical stages in their evolution. Probably for no other period is it so necessary or so difficult to observe in our thinking and writing the caution of Maitland when he says, "We shall have to think away distinctions which seem to us as clear as the sunshine; we must think ourselves back into a twilight. This we must do, not in a haphazard fashion, but of set purpose, knowing what we are doing."

Actual changes like this in our attitude toward particular historical problems have, however, not as a rule come about wholesale, or from any "set purpose". They have usually come piecemeal because someone has been steeping himself in the thought and motives of some past epoch by extensive and careful reading of the records or writings of the time, and one day wakes up to find—usually to his utter amazement—that this thought or these motives and institutions are not at all the ones he has been reading about all these years in the standard modern books. Then he gets to work. If I may be pardoned a personal allusion, I can never forget the shock—it was really consternation rather than mere surprise—when I suddenly realized that men like Lambarde or Fitzherbert in Elizabeth's time, when they spoke of a parliament, were thinking of something in many ways very different from what I had learned. It is a little shocking to find the actual makers or the contemporary recorders of the past saying or doing or thinking something entirely different

from the thing we have always had in mind, or, what is worse, have even been teaching to others as history.

But such shocks do not commonly arise out of the consciousness that our received notions of earlier historical developments fail to square with modern conditions. On the contrary, nine times out of ten it is just because these notions are too modern that the historian finally discovers that they do not fit the actual facts, that they furnish no explanation at all, or an obviously inadequate or even a distorted explanation of past movements and actions.

To see if this is true or not, it might be profitable to look at a few specific instances of revisions made in recent years in the field of our own earlier institutions which historical scholars have accepted generally as improvements. It is most interesting to compare, for example, the older traditional conception of these institutions in England just after the Conquest with the one now prevailing. The former is concisely stated in Freeman's *Growth of the English Constitution,* first published in 1872, and still survives in some of our textbooks; the latter is brilliantly set forth in Professor Stenton's *First Century of English Feudalism,* which appeared in 1932. To Freeman, apparently nearly as much as to Bishop Aylmer in the sixteenth century, all "the language and customes bee Englyshe and Saxonyshe". The words of our greatest modern master in this field are strikingly different. They were written by F. W. Maitland in 1895, or just before. He admits, as everyone must, that the Conqueror could not and did not "sweep away English law and put Norman law in its stead", nor ever intended to do so; but he sees, nevertheless, "one indelible mark" which the Conquest "has stamped forever on the whole body of our law". He continues:

> It would be hardly too much to say, that at the present day almost all our words that have a definite legal import are in a certain sense French words. . . . Earl was not displaced by count, sheriff was not displaced by viscount; our King, our Queen, our lords, our knights of the shire are English; our aldermen are English if our mayors are French; but our parliament and its statutes, our privy council and its ordinances, our peers, our barons, the commons of the realm, the sovereign, the state, the nation, the people are French; our citizens are French and our burgesses more French than English. . . . In the province of justice and police with its fines, its gaols and its prisons, its constables, its arrests, we must, now that outlawry is a thing of the past, go as far as the gallows if we would find an English institution.

The date of the final conquest of French over English in the courts Maitland significantly puts rather in 1166 than 1066, at the time of

Henry II's Assize of Clarendon instead of the Battle of Hastings, and he goes on to warn us that this fundamental change in language must be the index of much more. These may be only terms of law, but they touch life in all its phases. For "Language", he says, "is no mere instrument which we can control at will; it controls us. It is not a small thing that a law-book produced in the England of the thirteenth century will look very like some statement of a French *coutume* and utterly unlike the *Sachsenspiegel.*" When we pass from these more general matters to specific events of this period, the difference appears even more marked between the old interpretation and the new. Let us take the famous Salisbury oath of 1086, which brings up "perhaps the obscurest question in Anglo-Norman history", as Professor Stenton says. Speaking of it in his *Norman Conquest,* Freeman attacks certain "ingenious writers", because—to quote his own words—"they have picked out, as the act by which a Feudal System was introduced in England, the very act by which William's far-seeing wisdom took care that no Feudal System ever should grow up in England". These "ingenious writers" are chiefly lawyers, and in speaking of them Freeman says he is tempted to refer to St. Luke, XI, 52, which, by the way, reads as follows: "Woe unto you Lawyers: for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in, ye hindered." Following the Peterborough Chronicle, Freeman seems also to accept its statement that some 60,000 freemen took that oath in that unique "Gemót of Salisbury", which destroyed feudalism forever in England.

To Professor Stenton, on the other hand, the same transaction appears simply as an application on a large scale of the normal and widely extended feudal institution of liege homage, and he says "its authority was in accordance with the strictest feudal principles". Furthermore, in his view it was not all the freemen who took the oath at Salisbury, nor even the mere knights, but only "the leading mesne tenants, men with military resources of their own, and the personal influence which birth and experience gave. . . . And the social custom of the time regarded such men as barons 'whosesoever men they were'." Such a feudal and aristocratic interpretation is a far cry from Freeman's glowing Germanic democracy.

Another important institution of the same period furnishing a similar illustration of the change in historical treatment is the county court and the membership of that court under the Norman kings. Even Bishop Stubbs seemed to regard attendance at the court as a privilege or honor

so much cherished in twelfth century England that King Henry I found it necessary in a writ which still survives to restore the frequency and regularity of its meetings after a period of interruption. A more recent view is somewhat different. Attendance at these courts was no honor that members prized or communities sought for. Instead, this attendance was a nuisance to those members and a burden of service upon those communities which should not be exacted any oftener than precedent warranted. The well-known writ of Henry I for holding the county and hundred courts, it is thought, is not then, as Stubbs and his predecessors assumed, an order for the holding of these courts oftener than before; it is a command that they should meet less often. The amount of suit at court shall not be increased for the local communities; as the contemporary author of the so-called Laws of Henry I puts it, they are not "to be worried further by any wearisome burdens" (*nec ullis ultra fatigationibus agitari*). The grievance redressed here is not too little representation, but too much. Like changes have taken place in our modern accounts of the nature of the central assembly, the Great Council or *Magnum Concilium*. It is now usually thought of as essentially a meeting of tenants-in-chief in response to a royal summons to acquit their lands of a strictly feudal obligation, the obligation of counsel. This has diverged pretty far from Freeman's conception of a great national assembly at whose meetings "the whole people had an acknowledged right to attend". What was formerly considered a national privilege turns out to be only a feudal burden.

Such revisions of Anglo-Norman history all tend in one direction, and they may be considered sound or unsound, but no one can deny that they are momentous. They amount to a fundamental change in our notion of the whole of the social and political institutions in operation in that important period. They modify our ideas respecting almost every side of men's life at the time.

None of them, however, seems to have been prompted by any feeling that earlier historians had neglected the forces of the present in their treatment of the past. The changes noted above in our ideas about Norman England have come almost invariably from an enlarged estimate of the importance of feudal relations in the life of that period; and yet, if there is one thing conspicuous by its absence in the life and thought of our own time, it is feudalism. What really produced this great change, then, was no reading in of modern modes of thought or action, but a reading out. It has resulted from no attempt, conscious or uncon-

scious, to rewrite this part of the past in our own terms, but rather from a realization, born of careful research into the records of the time, that those records actually tell a story different from the one we have hitherto accepted as history.

Turning from the twelfth to the thirteenth century, we find similar changes of emphasis or of interpretation. One of these, at least, seems to have won the assent of historical scholars generally.

In 1853 Sir Edward Creasy described the Great Charter of King John as "a solemn instrument deliberately agreed on by the King, the prelates, the great barons, the gentry, the burghers, the yeomanry, and all the freemen of the realm". Of the famous words of its thirty-ninth chapter, "except by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land", he said, "I believe that the trial by peers here spoken of means trial by jury. The words will bear this meaning; it is certainly impossible to give them any other satisfactory meaning." The clause guarantees "full protection for property and person to every human being who breathes English air". This is a fair statement of the opinion of historians pretty generally in 1853, and no doubt it is law, for this identification of the feudal trial by peers and our trial by jury is made in many of our own state constitutions. But good law may be pretty bad history. Needless to say, no reputable historian accepts this view today, though it lives on in Fourth of July orations and no doubt will for years to come. Less generally accepted perhaps, but no less significant, is an apparent change in the attitude of historians toward the annulment of Magna Carta by Pope Innocent III. It has been usual to see in it something of a papal attack on the independence of an English church. Even as late as 1914 Mr. McKechnie could say that "the conception of an English Church that was something more than a mere branch of the church universal, began to take clearer shape", when English churchmen found that John was receiving sympathy and support from Rome. If there is any contemporary evidence that can be fairly interpreted in this sense, I do not know what it is. The reasons for the revocation given in the bull itself seem ample; they are chiefly the compulsion under which John's promises had been extorted and the surrender of royal authority which these promises involved. The first of these grounds is too obvious to need comment, the second is far more interesting constitutionally; but on either ground it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the pope could scarcely have given any other decision than he did; while the belief that Langton and John's other clerical opponents saw in it any attack on

their national church looks like just another of these anachronisms we have been tracing, which it is the business of the historian to disprove.

Historians have thought and apparently still often think they find a sort of national declaration of independence of the canon law of the Universal Church in the famous declaration by the barons at Merton in 1236, *Nolumus leges Angliae mutari*—"We are unwilling that the laws of England be changed." This nationalistic explanation seems still to be the one generally accepted, and a good deal of eloquence has been expended on these patriotic barons. But a revisionist with contemporary evidence in mind must have his doubts. No man in England in 1236, noble or non-noble, layman or ecclesiastic, would have dreamt of challenging the church's exclusive right to define legitimacy—the particular question then at issue—or to determine it in a particular case in its own courts. The barons do not say they repudiate cannon law; they do not even say they repudiate the church's definition of legitimacy; they claim for themselves no jurisdiction over legitimacy generally; they only say that in determining a right of succession to English land, which is a proprietary right, the king's courts will follow the ancient English land law relative to succession in cases of illegitimacy in preference to any other rule. It might be added that although the Statute of Merton, of which this is one of the sections, is always printed among the Statutes of the Realm, it antedates any surviving statute roll, and how it originally got the name and authority of a statute must be considered now a question of much greater doubt, since the recent notable investigations of Messrs. Richardson and Sayles into the history of the early statutes.

Other instances of the same thing will no doubt occur to you. This same antedated nationalism that formed our traditional estimate of the Statute of Merton and inspired McKechnie's criticisms of Innocent III's revocation of Magna Carta has also suggested similar modern objections to the arbitration of St. Louis in 1264, in which he declared that the Provisions of Oxford of 1258 were void, even though enacted with Henry III's formal assent, because they were an infringement of the king's royal authority. It has not always been sufficiently noticed that this constitutional objection of St. Louis is the same that Innocent III had made against parts of Magna Carta, nor has enough weight been given to this and to other contemporary evidence for the existence at this time in England of a constitutional principle which seems to forbid even the king himself, much more any of the king's subjects, to "blemish" the rights of the crown, and renders null and void even a royal act

which attempts it. If such a principle was in existence then, St. Louis' decision, like Innocent III's, was probably the only one that could be justified then or now, in view of all the circumstances of the case.

Similarly, of course, these considerations must affect our estimate of Simon de Montfort and his work. We may admire as much as before the nobility of his character and aims and recognize the great significance of his acts and proposals, but we are less likely now to call this nobility patriotism or to defend those acts as constitutional. In the same way, and for much the same reasons, important recent historical research into the origins of English representation has made it impossible any longer to refer to him, as the German historian Pauli did, as "The Founder of the House of Commons".

What the retrospective nationalism of the older histories has done in this way for the work of Simon de Montfort, retrospective constitutionalism has done for the administration of King Edward I. He was the hero of Stubbs's great constitutional epic. Now he is regarded rather as a champion of prerogative than of constitutionalism; but to think of him thus, as a man of his own time rather than of a later time, is in no way really to detract from the nobility of his character or the true greatness of his designs. If one thing in his reign more than another might serve to illustrate our changing historical views, it is what I could now probably speak of without risk as "the Myth of the Model Parliament".

So we might go on to the revaluations of the great ordinances of 1311 and the Statute of York which repealed them and enacted what Stubbs, in his constitutional enthusiasm, regarded as the provision establishing the share of the commons in legislation. We might pass to the great ecclesiastical statutes of the middle of Edward III's reign, the statutes of Provisors and Praemunire, and Maitland's classic exposure of their nationalistic interpreters and the naïve *non sequitur* that they had proved the existence of an opposition to papal authority among the English clergy because they had been able to show an opposition to the clergy among the English laity.

When we reached the Tudors in a survey of this kind it might seem at last that we had come to a period in which historical revision was to take a more modern form, something possibly almost like a rewriting in terms of our own day. For so far as there has been any recent revision in the historian's conception of this epoch it has seemed to incline to a softening of the old accepted phrase "Tudor absolutism" as a characterization of the time. At last we might seem to need a little more modern

constitutionalism instead of reactionary antiquarianism if we were to reach a just estimate of the period. Like most such sweeping phrases, "Tudor absolutism" does cover a multitude of sins, not only past but present. In the reign of Henry VIII, at least, there is plenty of oppression, much injustice, at times intolerable cruelty. There can be no doubt of that, but can we properly call it a despotism? Strictly, it was not. The king had great power, and at times he greatly abused what he had, but he certainly did not legally have *all* power: there were limits to what he could legitimately do. His mere will was not law. It is impossible to characterize the Tudor reigns as an absolutism or a despotism in any proper sense of those terms.

Bishop Aylmer has been quoted for his fantastic chauvinism, but when he could forget that, he was a remarkably keen observer, and he might be quoted again in this connection:

> But to what purpose is all this? To declare that it is not in England so dangerous a matter to have a woman ruler, as men take it to be—If on the other part, the regement were such as all hanged upon the King's or quene's will, and not upon the lawes written; if she might decre and make lawes alone, without her senate; if she judged offences according to her wisdom, and not by limitation of statutes and laws; if she might dispose alone of war and peace; if, to be short, she were a mer monarch, and not a mixed ruler, you might peradventure make me fear the matter the more, and the less defend the cause.

That is a very remarkable statement of constitutionalism to be written in 1559, and there is plenty of other contemporary evidence in support of it which I cannot stop to cite. Clearly we must temper our phrase, "Tudor absolutism". But is this because it is too modern to fit the facts, or because it is not modern enough? The answer to that question depends on another—whether despotism or absolutism is itself a medieval or a modern form or ideal of government. Without doubt it is modern, not medieval. In fact, in sixteenth century England medieval constitutionalism was fighting for its life against the new, the more modern despotic tendencies, but it survived there. In sixteenth century France the same battle was going on, but the outcome was different; there modern absolutism replaced an older constitutionalism, to last till the Revolution of 1789; the "tempered monarchy" of earlier times gave way before the personal rule of the Bourbon kings. What we still chiefly need, then, even for Tudor England, if we are to comprehend it better, is a more thorough understanding not so much of its modern innovations as of its great medieval heritage.

Need I cite more examples of such anachronisms as these? Because they were political liberals, St. Thomas Aquinas must now be made over into a modern Whig and Cardinal Bellarmine into a democrat; because they believed in a restricted royal prerogative, men like Sir John Eliot and Sir Matthew Hale have to be turned into preposterous parliamentary Austinians. This is about the last and the worst case of this kind of procedure. Lessons may be got in this fashion, no doubt, but they will not be the lessons of history. The quickest and the surest way of finding the present in the past, but hardly the soundest, is to put it there first.

The illustrations above have practically all been taken from the earlier history of our own constitutionalism in the mother country, but further illustrations, equally pertinent, will no doubt occur to you from historical fields other than the constitutional and from other lands than England.

But here someone may object. He may say, as Glaucon said to Socrates in Plato's *Republic,* that this rehearsal thus far has been all negative. If it is true that some measure of objective history can really be reached, as has been maintained, then one ought to be able to point to something positive in that history, something not completely vitiated by the fallacies we have been tracing.

It is with a good deal of hesitation that I would venture to put forward one or two general political principles that do seem to accord with the words and actions of men throughout the earlier part of our constitutional history and yet have persisted to our own time or almost to it—principles, therefore, that may possibly survive the tests by which we have ventured to discard some others. Probably the best way to suggest these principles here is in the form of a commentary on one of the texts that expresses them best. It is the well-known line of Bracton in which he says, *Rex non debet esse sub homine, sed sub Deo et lege*—"The king ought not to be under a man but under God and the law." It would be hard to fix on any sentence outside Scripture more quoted in our later constitutional struggles than this, but the way it has usually been quoted is rather amazing. How many times we have all seen the last part of this maxim repeated, "under God and the law"! But how often do we ever see a quotation of the first part—"non sub homine", not under a man? Yet Bracton himself put both these parts together, and he put "non sub homine" first. Some English royalists of the seventeenth century quoted the first part of Bracton's sentence and stopped there; many more on the parliamentary side repeated the last part and

began with it. Practically none, to my knowledge, made use of both parts of Bracton's statement, and this is probably not surprising. It is always a favorite trick of propagandists to quote half a sentence and carefully omit the rest. But how shall we explain the fact that sober historians in later times have in this case done the same thing and kept on doing it? Why have we all gone on for ages repeating the words, "under God and the law", and as regularly omitting, "not under a man"? If we could answer those two questions satisfactorily, we might find that we had incidentally answered some others of very general historical significance and possibly even of some practical importance to the world today.

The king, Bracton says, should have no man over him, but he should have over him the law. In ignoring the former part of this statement we are no doubt assuming that it does not fit our modern conditions, that it is untrue for us. That assumption might be questioned; but historians seem to have assumed even more than this, and the present argument is addressed to historians. In virtually suppressing this first part of Bracton's explicit statement, "not under a man", we appear also to condemn him, tacitly at least, of a misunderstanding of the political conditions in his own day. We reason, I take it, somewhat as follows: Bracton has said that the king should be under the law. This can mean one thing only; namely, that others either stand over the king to impose a penalty on him if he breaks or exceeds this law, or have at least an authority, independent of him, to oppose his acts. It can mean nothing less than this; therefore, our author's assertion which contradicts it, that none should be over the king and none equal with him, must be just a slip. It cannot be coupled with the words "sub lege"; it is obviously untrue, and therefore Bracton must have been in error in making it. I have called this an assumption. It looks more like presumption. We in the twentieth century are venturing to tell the ablest English constitutionalist of the thirteenth that he is all wrong about his own country and his own times, that we know more about it than he did. Suppose, then, we should adopt the more modest alternative, at least as a temporary hypothesis, should assume that the discrepancies in Bracton may after all be more apparent than real, and should set to work seriously to examine the institutions and ideas of Bracton's time for contemporary indications as to the accuracy of his statements or the possibility of reconciling seeming contradictions in them.

There is no need to bring evidence to show the general acceptance

of the second part of Bracton's maxim, "sub Deo et lege", either in his own time or by modern historians. It is generally admitted, though hardly sufficiently to account for all the facts of the sixteenth century. The part requiring proof is the first part, "non sub homine". Yet, what Socrates says of justice in Plato's *Republic* may be equally applicable here—"what we were looking for has all this while been rolling before our feet and we never saw it". For what but a constitutional doctrine like Bracton's could have led Innocent III to quash a king's charter because it contained a loss or surrender of royal right (*regalis juris dispendium*); what but this could have been in the mind of St. Louis in 1264 when he declared that King Henry III "should have full power in his realm and government free of control" (*plenam potestatem et liberum regimen habeat in regno suo*); or on what other principle can we account for parliament's repeal in 1322 of an ordinance already assented to by the king, ostensibly of his own "free will"?

There are many other evidences of the existence and the continuance of this constitutional principle of Bracton's, and one of the most interesting comes late in the fifteenth century, in the very heyday of the so-called "Lancastrian constitution" and from the greatest of Lancastrian "constitutionalists", Sir John Fortescue. In the famous and oft-quoted phrase by which he characterizes the existing English monarchy, "regimen politicum et regale", Fortescue couples together "politicum" and "regale", just as Bracton did the two like parts of his maxim; and if Bracton's two statements contradict each other, so do Fortescue's. We must, in fact, condemn practically all medieval authorities as muddle-headed if there is not justification for every part of Bracton's dictum.

The explanation of all this confusion is simple enough. We historians have been confusing two things that contemporaries were always careful to distinguish, *restriction* and *control*. They held that the king's authority was legally restricted, or bounded, or "limited" in its extent—"sub Deo et lege", a "regimen politicum", as Fortescue put it; but it does not follow that they did not, or that they should not believe that his rule was at the same time "free"—"non sub homine", in Fortescue's terms a "regimen regale", a "regimen liberum" in St. Louis'.

One part of Bracton's sentence has to do with the extent, the other with the manner of royal government. The confusion of these two is no mistake of contemporaries; it seems to be our own, and probably no similar lack of discrimination has ever caused more serious misrepresentations of history than this unfortunate failure to distinguish medieval *limitation* from modern *control*.

To the end almost of the sixteenth century English constitutional history is not fully clear without some reference to this old distinction. In 1587, in Cavendish's case, Elizabeth bowed when the judges ignored her express command to transfer an office from one man to another—the command was *ultra vires;* but in 1575 the intrepid Peter Wentworth had been sent to the Tower for even discussing the exercise of the queen's authority as "supreme governor"—that was an attempt at *control.*

Even the process by which this older notion of limitation gradually grew into something more, in the development of a real control by a representative parliament becoming more and more conscious of its power—even this, in its full historical significance, is likely to escape us if we have no appreciation of the older ideas and institutions out of which the new ones grew. *The Winning of the Initiative by the House of Commons,* as Professor Notestein has so aptly termed this great change, can never have much real meaning for us if we allow ourselves to forget that this initiative did, after all, have to be *won.*

In Bracton's line, *Rex non debet esse sub homine, sed sub Deo et lege,* we have apparently, at least one positive principle of lasting importance, a faithful summation of medieval politics; and in the later modification of it we might find a considerable part of the modern. Consideration of it seems to point to the fact that we must distinguish pretty carefully in our history between autocracy and despotism; it seems to indicate that the medieval king was an autocrat, was absolute in the sense of having no superior, but was anything but despotic, in that his *jura regalia* left off where the rights of his subjects began. He was in fact limited but not controlled.

When we look for survivals of such principles in later times, after the initiative had been won, we must substitute the modern "government" for the medieval king, but a modern historian might find some illustration of this same old principle in the solidarity of the English cabinet; and even the American historian may wonder whether our bills of rights which embody this principle may not be a surer safeguard of liberty than an overextension of checks and balances which violate it in making government innocuous only by making it ineffective, and by splitting it up do little else than render it irresponsible.

As historians, our real task is with history, not with its application; but when troubles come upon us, the question will always emerge—it will not down—whether it belongs to the historian, even if not strictly *as* a historian, to find in all these facts and developments, assuming them to be accurate, any lessons of value that may be practically useful.

I sincerely believe that it does; but like that other "earnest desirer of his countrie's peace" already referred to, if I tried to urge any such lessons for our present troubles, I should be "telling my medicine" only as a bystander, and not as a physician. If there are any practical inferences to be drawn from this jumbled survey, therefore, I leave them for you to draw.

C. H. McIlwain.

*Harvard University.*

# *EXPEDICIO BILLARUM ANTIQUITUS*

## An Unpublished Chapter of Elsynge's Treatise on Parliament

### I

All students of seventeenth century English parliamentary history are familiar with the important treatise by Henry Elsynge, *The Manner of Holding Parliaments in England*. The development of parliament in the seventeenth century is, indeed, reflected to a notable degree in the literature of the period. From the latter half of the reign of James I to the end of the seventeenth century there was a constant, almost yearly, increase in the amount of literature relating to parliament. Much of it was occasioned directly by the long struggle between the crown and parliament and was propagandist in motive and controversial in nature. There is, however, still another type of seventeenth century parliamentary literature. This consists of learned treatises on parliament in its various aspects: its origin, nature, powers, and procedure. Among these treatises, that by Henry Elsynge stands out as a peculiarly authoritative and learned account. It was completed in 1625, a fact attested by Elsynge's own autograph draft, which is to be found in the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum. The treatise is number 1342 of that collection and will be referred to hereafter as Harl. MS. 1342. The manuscript bears the Latin title *Modus tenendi Parliamentum apud Anglos* and at the end, on folio 157, the following date and signature:

3 Maij: 1625 H: Elsynge
Cler. par:

Although the treatise was completed in 1625, it was not published until 1660. There were several subsequent editions, the latest being that of 1768, under the editorship of Thomas Tyrwhit, the philologist, who was clerk of the house of commons from 1762 to 1768.[1] This last edition is in every sense the best, since it was carefully collated with Elsynge's draft and is thus an accurate copy. All further references to the printed treatise will be to this edition of 1768.

Henry Elsynge's active connection with the house of lords, as clerk of the parliaments, began in March, 1620, when he was appointed deputy

[1] The various editions are those of 1660, 1662, 1663, 1675, 1679, and 1768.

to the then clerk, Robert Bowyer, his uncle by marriage. Bowyer died almost immediately after this, and Elsynge was sworn in as clerk on March 21, 1620, and held the office until his death in 1635.[2] His attendance on the house of lords and his consequent intimate acquaintance with the procedure of parliament, together with that scholarly inclination which led him to use with care and diligence all available records, are alone sufficient to render his treatise worthy of the serious consideration which it has received.

It is evident that this treatise was intended by the author to be only a part of a larger work; that it was, in fact, to be the first part or book of such a work was known by Tyrwhit. There are a number of references in the printed treatise which support this. For example, in speaking of the commons' care to maintain their privileges in relation to the lords, Elsynge writes: "they have appropriated more unto themselves of late than ever they claimed heretofore; I mean, judicature, which they ever disclaimed; as shall be shewn hereafter".[3] Elsynge does not recur to the subject of judicature in the printed treatise. There is a similar reference in chapter VIII on "Receivers and Triers of Petitions". There Elsynge writes, in the discussion of the appointment of receivers and triers: "That [record] of 6 Edward 3. saith, *Par nostre seigneur le roy & son consell.* By *his council* are here understood those of the *privy council,* who were summoned to Parliament, and not the lords of Parliament, as shall be declared elsewhere."[4] Here again the published treatise makes no later reference to the subject. These two citations certainly suggest that the author planned a continuation of his work.

More convincing and specific evidence of this intention, however, is to be found in Elsynge's own draft of the treatise. The title page of Harl. MS. 1342 indicates very definitely that the published treatise is but the first book of a projected larger treatise. It reads:

> Modus tenendi Parliamentum apud Anglos
> In two Bookes
> The first of ye Forme and all things incident thereunto
> The second of matters handled in parlement.[5]

The subjects of the eight chapters of the published treatise are consistent with the statement that the first book is to describe "ye Forme and all

[2] *Notes and Queries,* CLVI, 118.

[3] Henry Elsynge, *The Manner of Holding Parliaments in England,* p. 183.

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 268. In all citations the spelling of the original has been preserved except that abbreviations have been completed.

[5] Harl. MS. 1342, f. 1.

things incident thereunto"; for herein are discussed "Summons", "Appearances", "Locus et Modus Sedendi", "Parliament Days", "Proxies", "De Summonitionis Causa", "Prolocutor Domus Communis", and "Receivers and Triers of Petitions". The last paragraph of Harl. MS. 1342, which is not to be found in the printed treatise, further supports the evidence given by the title page; for Elsynge's manuscript of chapter VIII closes with the words: "Here I will ende this eight [sic] and last chapter of this firste booke of Modus tenendi parliamentum. which I collected . . . with noe intent to publishe the same unto any."[6]

The final and most conclusive piece of evidence to be derived from Harl. MS. 1342 shows not only that Elsynge intended to write a second book but also that he had made some progress with it. Folio 158, the last in the volume, contains, in Elsynge's hand, the table of contents of the second book. Thomas Tyrwhit had examined this table of contents, and it was on the basis of it that he conjectured that Elsynge intended to write a second book, although Tyrwhit himself "found no reason to think that Mr. *Elsynge* made any further progress in this second book".[7] An exact copy of this table of contents follows. The words and numbers printed in italics have been struck out in the manuscript, presumably by Elsynge, and the crosses in the margin appear there as indicated.

The Contents of the Seconde booke.

Cap. 8. 12.

begunn, but
god knowes
when I shall
finish this
booke.
Sept: 1625.

× 1. Warre & Peace. begunn by me. enlarged by Sr Robt Cotton.
× 2. Subsidyes
3. *Coronae dignitas & praerogativa Regis.* N. M. T.
× 4. Judicature.
× 5. Peticions & bills, & their proceedings anciently.
× 6. Proceedinges on bills at this daye.
7. *Messages & Conferences.*
8. 7. *Conferences* Continuances, adiournements, prorogacions & dissoluccions of Parlements.
8. The Ministerial Officers, & their place &
9. duityes.
10. *Ordinances. Actes. Statutes.*

include this
in the next.

10. Rotuli Ordinacionum. Actuum. Statutorum.
8. & the Journall booke.
11. *Errata in parliamentis, & by whom Comitted. my owne especially.*

[6] *Ibid.*, f. 157.
[7] Elsynge, p. viii.

Diligent search has failed to discover any publication which could be identified with this second book. Moreover, Tyrwhit, whom we have quoted above, evidently did not know of either a printed or a manuscript version of the second book, either in whole or in part. There is reason to conclude, nevertheless, that at least part of this second book was written. The first chapter, on war and peace, is said by Elsynge himself, in the table of contents, to have been "begunn by me. enlarged by Sr Robt Cotton". Presumably, Elsynge refers to Sir Robert Cotton's tract, *That the Kings of England have been pleased, usually, to consult with their Peers in the great Council, and Commons in Parliament, Of Marriage, Peace and War,* published in 1679. How much of this was written by Elsynge and how much by Cotton, we cannot tell.

There is reason to believe that another chapter was written, this by Elsynge alone, though it has apparently not been published; namely, the fifth chapter, on "Peticions & bills, & their proceedings anciently". The British Museum possesses six manuscript copies of a tract on this subject, entitled, variously, *Expedicio Billarum Antiquitus* and *Expeditionis Billarum Antiquitas*. Four of these are to be found in the Additional Manuscripts, of which they are catalogued as numbers 26643, 18911 (ff. 2-134), 4489, and 5668. Of the other two copies, one is number 6585 of the Harleian Manuscripts, and the other is number 102 of the collection purchased by the British government from Francis Hargrave and deposited in the British Museum as the Hargrave Manuscripts. Add. MS. 26643 appears to be the oldest of the six copies. The British Museum considers that the calligraphy of the manuscript indicates that it was written in the early seventeenth century. The manuscript bears on the last folio (140) the date "24. Aprill, 1632".[8] The title page of the manuscript reads:

> Modus tenendi Parliamentum apud Anglos.
> Lib. 2. Cap. 5to.
> Expedicio Billarum antiquitus.

Although no author is named here, the correspondence is obvious be-

[8] It is one of a collection of nineteen manuscripts which once belonged to Oliver St. John, lord chief justice of the common pleas, and his family. Of this group, number 26642 is a copy of Elsynge's first book, under the Latin title, *Modus tenendi Parliamentum apud Anglos*. Number 26645 is a treatise entitled *The modern forme of the Parliament of England* and is attributed in the catalogue of Additional Manuscripts to Elsynge. However, there is no internal evidence to so identify its author. Add. MS. 26644, also of the St. John collection, is entitled *The Course of Passing Bills in Parliament* and is attributed in the catalogue of Additional Manuscripts to Elsynge. This is an error. The treatise is by William Hakewill and exists in several printed editions.

tween this title and chapter numbering and that given for chapter V in Elsynge's table of contents for the second book.[9] Add. MS. 18911 is a volume of the unpublished transcripts of Thomas Rymer, the editor of the *Foedera*.[10] The transcript of the tract in question (ff. 2-134) is incomplete at the beginning, and it is without title or name of author. The British Museum catalogue of Additional Manuscripts, however, attributes the tract to Elsynge. Add. MS. 4489 is the eleventh volume of the collection of transcripts made by Thomas Madox, who succeeded Rymer as historiographer royal in 1714. It bears, on folio 1, the title *Expeditionis Billarum Antiquitas,* but no authorship is assigned to it.[11] Add. MS. 5668 bears, on folio 2, the same title and likewise names no author. Harl. MS. 6585 also has the same title, and, while the original manuscript itself gives no author, a later hand has noted on folio 1, "Elsings Bills in Parlt. Mss. perfect. June 13-74". The catalogue of Harleian Manuscripts definitely attributes the tract to Elsynge. Hargrave MS. 102, the last of the six copies, also is entitled *Expeditionis Billarum Antiquitas* and likewise fails to name the author.

With this last manuscript there is a lengthy note or rather a series of notes written by Francis Hargrave at intervals during a period of twenty-four years, relating to the tract and its author. Hargrave had reached the conclusion that this tract was the fifth chapter of the second book of Elsynge's treatise on parliament. He mentioned the Madox transcript, Add. MS. 4489,[12] but apparently had seen no other manuscript copies, especially not the one which later became Add. MS. 26643. He had examined Elsynge's draft of the first book, in Harl. MS. 1342, and had seen the table of contents for the second book. His final con-

[9] See above, p. 227.

[10] "Fifty-eight of these volumes [Rymer's transcripts] now form the Additional Mss in the British Museum, from No. 4573 to No. 4630 inclusive. The 59th vol. was not given up to the Museum with the other fifty-eight volumes but is now No. 18,911 of the Add. Mss." Thomas Duffus Hardy, *Syllabus (in English) of the Documents Relating to England and Other Kingdoms Contained in the Collection Known as "Rymer's Foedera"* (London, 1869), I, lxxx, n.

[11] For reference to this manuscript see the following, where the author has not been identified at all, or where the authorship has been attributed to the copyist, Madox: Richard Wooddeson, *Systematical View of the Laws of England* (London, 1792), I, 25, n; Richard Burn, *Ecclesiastical Law* (2d ed., London, 1767), I, 201; *The Statutes at Large from Magna Charta to the End of the Last Parliament, 1761,* Owen Ruffhead, ed. (London, 1769), I, xv, n.

[12] "Amongst the Mss. of Mr. Madox in the British Museum there is a tract with the same title as this: & from an extract in Mr. Wooddeson's Systematical View of the Laws of England, it appears to be the same tract. . . . F. H." Hargr. MS. 102, f. 2.

clusion was: "I am now satisfied, not only that Mr. Elsinge was the Author of this Treatise entitled *Expeditionis Billarum Antiquitas,* but that this Treatise is a chapter in part of a continuation of his *Modus tenendi Parliamentum.*" [13]

In addition to the external evidence offered by these copies of *Expedicio Billarum Antiquitus* there is considerable and convincing evidence to be derived from the body of the tract itself. This internal evidence falls into three classes. In the first place, there are a few references to the author. At the beginning of the discussion of the exhibiting of bills the treatise reads: "For as touching the agreement thereon amongst the Comons nothing is recorded thereof in the parliament Rolles (neither doth that belonge to my place to knowe)." [14] This would suggest that the author's association was with the lords, not the commons. More definite and specific evidence is supplied by the following statement, on folio 28$^{v}$: "I finde by the Collecions of Mr. Hennage my learned predecessor in the Records in the Tower that he was of my opinion". Francis Hargrave was especially interested in this statement as a means of identifying the author. He consulted Thomas Astle, the antiquarian, in the matter, and on the basis of information received from him attributed the tract to Elsynge. Astle's letter to Hargrave is to be found in Hargr. MS. 102 on folio 118. It lists the keepers of the records in the Tower from the ninth year of Elizabeth to the seventeenth of Charles II as follows: William Bowyer, Thomas Heneage, Michael Heneage, William Lambarde, Roger Wilbraham, Robert Bowyer and Henry Elsynge, John Burroughs, Nicholas Parker, and William Prynne. Finally, in the conclusion of the discussion of the form of the statute, on folio 119$^{v}$, there is this statement: "I have examined divers other Statuts with the Peticions & Annswers, but these 3. will suffice to shewe the forme thereof, which is all the Clerke needs to understand."

The first of these references suggests that the author was connected, in some capacity, with the house of lords, and the last indicates that he was clerk of that house, that is, clerk of the parliaments. The second shows that he was keeper of the records in the Tower and that a "Mr. Hennage" had preceded him, at some time, in that office. Reverting, for the moment, to Astle's list of the keepers of the Tower, it appears

[13] *Ibid.*, f. 1$^{v}$.

[14] Add. MS. 26643, f. 4. All references will be to this manuscript, apparently the oldest copy.

that all the keepers save Henry Elsynge and those who succeeded him are eliminated immediately on the ground of time, for *Expedicio* refers, specifically, to proceedings in parliament on May 23, 1628,[15] and by that time Robert Bowyer and all those who preceded him were dead. Of the four not eliminated on this ground, that is, Elsynge, Burroughs, Parker, and Prynne, only Elsynge was both clerk of the parliaments and keeper of the Tower records. There is thus already good reason to attribute the tract to Elsynge.

The second type of internal evidence supports the conclusion that *Expedicio* was written as part of a larger work. More than once it is described as a "chapter". The earliest example of such a reference occurs in the first sentence, which reads: "This Chapter shall shewe the proceedings on Bills in Parlement when the Statute was drawen up out of the Peticions & Annsweres."[16] There is a similar reference on folio 60$^{v}$, where the author says: "And afterwards I will shewe the many inconveniences which happened thereby to the suiect [*sic*] wherewith I will end this tedious Chapter." On folio 100 it is said: "The Conclusion of this Chapter touching the Expediteing of Bills anciently shalbe the Statute made thereon."

There are other references which not only indicate that this tract was intended to be a chapter of a larger work but also are sufficiently specific to enable us to identify the latter with a high degree of probability. References of this kind will be cited in the order of their occurrence. On folio 6$^{v}$ occurs this statement: "But when that first began shall be discussed in the next Chapter of Proceeding on Bills at this daye."[17] Likewise folio 140, the last one, contains a similar reference to "the next Chapter of Proceedings uppon Bills att this day". It will be observed that in Elsynge's table of contents for the second book of his treatise the chapter on "Proceedinges on bills at this day" follows immediately the chapter on "Peticions & bills, & their proceedings anciently".[18]

On folio 9 there is a still more specific reference, for the author, in speaking of private petitions, states that "Other Annsweres were seldome made to those peticions by the Triers (when they were appointed) as I have shewen elsewhere Cap. 7. lib. 1." An examination of Elsynge's published treatise may, at first, seem to invalidate the assumption that

[15] *Ibid.*, f. 28$^{v}$.

[16] *Ibid.*, f. 3.

[17] For a discussion of this chapter, see below, pp. 234 ff.

[18] See above, p. 227.

it is the "lib. 1", or Book I, to which reference is made here; for the subject of the seventh chapter of the treatise is "Prolocutor Domus Communis", and the chapter contains no discussion of private petitions. However, the eighth and last chapter of the treatise is entitled "Receivers and Triers of Petitions" and includes a discussion of the answering of private petitions.[19] It would seem, therefore, that the assumption remains valid, inasmuch as the substitution of 7 for 8 can easily be accounted for as an error of the copyist, and Add. MS. 26643 is evidently the work of a copyist and not the author's draft.[20] The hypothesis of a copyist's error is confirmed by another reference of the same kind in *Expedicio*. On folio 91 of Add. MS. 26643, at the beginning of the section entitled "Authoritate Parliamenti", there occurs this statement: "the words (*Authoritate Parliamenti*) without other Circumstances doe not prove this Comon assent of Parlement. ffor you shall finde the same in the Annswers unto divers private peticions *tempe* Richard 2. & Henry 4. uppon the fyles onely & not entred in ye parlement Roll whereof I have spoken already in that of Receavors & Tryors of Peticions—lib. 1. cap. 8." Here, of course, is a complete correspondence between Add. MS. 26643 and Elsynge's printed book, for, as was stated above, the eighth chapter of the latter deals with the subject of Receivers and Triers of Petitions, and the last section of that chapter is concerned with petitions endorsed *authoritate Parliamenti*.[21]

There are two further references in the body of *Expedicio Billarum Antiquitus* which are relevant to the question of its authorship. On folio 108$^{v}$, in discussing the trial of prelates, the author refers to a previous discussion of the same subject, namely, "the Chapter of Judicature". The table of contents for the second book shows that Elsynge intended to write a chapter on judicature and that this was to precede immediately the chapter on "Peticions & bills, & their proceedings anciently".[22] Finally, on folio 131$^{v}$, there is reference to a chapter intended to follow *Expedicio:* "the Statute Rolls from 6. Edward 1. are extant but divers

[19] Elsynge, pp. 275-288.

[20] The lack of corrections, interpolations, directions to copyists, etc., indicates this. The contrast between this manuscript and Harl. MS. 1342 is striking.

[21] Elsynge, pp. 294-298. *Cf.* Francis Hargrave's comment: "This reference here to the author's chapter on Receivers & Triers of Petitions, namely to Lib. 1. ch. 8. answers to chapter 8. of Elsinge's Printed Book on the Manner of holding Parliaments. . . . . This not only confirms my conjecture of Elsinge's being the author of this Manuscript Treatise; but imports that it is a part of a continuation of his Modus tenendi Parliamentum". Hargr. MS. 102, f. 77$^{v}$.

[22] See above, p. 227.

Statuts are omitted therein, even since the said tyme whereof I shall have occasion to speake more in the Chapter of the Statute Roll, Parlement Roll, and Journall Booke". The last chapter of Elsynge's second book was to have dealt with "Rotuli Ordinacionum. Actuum. Statutorum. & the Journall booke".

On the basis of the evidence presented above there is little reason to doubt that the tract *Expedicio Billarum Antiquitus* was written as a part, the fifth chapter, of a projected continuation of Henry Elsynge's treatise, *The Manner of Holding Parliaments in England*. The title page of Add. MS. 26643, an early seventeenth century copy of *Expedicio*, states that the tract is the fifth chapter of the second book of *Modus tenendi Parliamentum apud Anglos*, although it names no author; the title *Expedicio Billarum Antiquitus* is but a Latin version of the title "Peticions & bills, & their proceedings anciently"; and this, we know, Elsynge intended to be the subject of the fifth chapter of his second book. Various references, to be found in the body of *Expedicio* and cited above, lead to the same conclusion.

It is possible that two other chapters of the second book, the third, on judicature, and the sixth, on "Proceedings on bills at this daye", were composed, at least in part. In *Expedicio*, on folio 108$^{v}$ of Add. MS. 26643, there is a reference to a chapter on judicature. The author's words are, "as I have shewed in the Chapter of Judicature". This statement would seem to indicate that the author had already composed the chapter in question. There appears to be no printed work on judicature by Elsynge. It is possible, however, that chapter VII of the tract on *The Modern forme of the Parliament of England*,[23] a chapter entitled "Proceedings in Judicature", is by Elsynge. The treatment of judicature there is limited to a discussion of judgments against delinquents. Possibly this was intended as part of the fourth chapter of the second book. In addition to the reference to a chapter on judicature there are in Add. MS. 26643, on folios 6$^{v}$ and 140, two references to a chapter on modern legislative procedure, a chapter described on folio 140 as "the next Chapter of Proceedings uppon Bills att this day". This would thus be chapter VI of the second book, if *Expedicio* is chapter V, and reference to the table of contents shows that Elsynge intended to deal with modern procedure in chapter VI. It is possible that this "next Chapter" is a tract published under the title of *The Method of Passing Bills in Parliament* (London, 1685), the title page of which states that the author is "Henry

[23] See above, n. 8.

Elsynge, Cler. Par." There is no internal evidence as to its authorship. The tract deals entirely with the legislative procedure of the house of lords.

II

The extreme probability that *Expedicio Billarum Antiquitus,* hitherto unpublished, was written by Henry Elsynge and as a chapter of a projected continuation of his famous treatise lends it considerable interest from the antiquarian point of view. The subject of the chapter, however, is of wider interest. Early procedure on bills, that is, the procedure of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which is the subject of this chapter, is a matter of importance in English constitutional history and is still, in spite of much research, relatively obscure. There is a dearth of treatises describing medieval procedure; in fact, there is apparently no known treatise, either contemporary or later, describing it in detail. Professor Howard L. Gray, in his book on the influence of the commons on legislation in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, cites a seventeenth century treatise on the procedure of that time and regrets that the "possibly valuable comment on earlier practice" is missing.[24] All due caution must be observed in estimating the value of a seventeenth century account of fourteenth and fifteenth century procedure. Moreover, although *Expedicio,* like Elsynge's printed treatise, was written obviously in a scholarly spirit, it should be considered in relation to the time in which it was produced, a time of strife between the crown and parliament. For all these reasons it cannot be regarded as a definitive account of early procedure. Yet, undoubtedly, it is a good indication of what a seventeenth century student of parliamentary institutions knew about early procedure. It may, therefore, be of some value in the elucidation of "peticions & bills & their proceedings anciently". For this reason, it has seemed worth while to give a brief description of its contents.

The author's purpose is "to shewe the proceedings on Bills in Parlement when the Statute was drawen up out of the Peticions & Annsweres".[25] The scope of the discussion is broad; the procedure on bills or petitions is described from the time of their exhibition by the commons to the time when they received the royal assent; there is then a description of the making or ordinances and statutes; finally, there is an analysis of the "many inconveniences" of the "ancient" procedure.

[24] Howard Levi Gray, *The Influence of the Commons on Early Legislation* (Cambridge, 1932), p. 3.

[25] Add. MS. 26643, f. 3.

The method of treatment is uniform throughout. There is first a statement of the point which is to be discussed and of the disputable questions arising from it. Then follow the precedents bearing upon the subject. Most of the precedents cited are from the reigns of Edward III and Richard II, but they range from the reign of Henry III to that of Henry VII and are derived from the original petitions or bills and the answers to them, the rolls of parliament, and the rolls of statutes. The author's conclusions are based on cited precedents, and where precedents are lacking, he refuses to resolve the question.[26]

The author first establishes the identity of the terms "bill" and "petition" and then describes the earlier manner of exhibiting bills to the lords. They were generally exhibited by the commons, "it being their part petere legem as best knowing what was amisse". In those days the commons, "howsoever . . . [they] agreed amongst themselves unto the bills exhibitted unto the Lords yett they might easily be abused (as oftentymes they were) by Bills delivered in their names". This was because they had not yet settled upon the form of presenting their bills by one "Select messenger accompanied with divers others of their house". By whom their bills were exhibited cannot, therefore, be certainly known. As to the time of exhibition, it might be at any time after the declaration of the cause of summoning the parliament, "unlesse in those Parlements . . . called for Speedy Releefe of the King some caution were given to the contrary". The petitions of the assembled commons, as distinguished from private petitions presented by individuals or groups outside of the parliament, were delivered not to the receivers of petitions but to the lords themselves or, if their lordships were not sitting, to the clerk of the parliaments, "who happily was to keepe them untill their next appointed day of sitteing".[27]

The next section of this chapter is devoted to the thesis that the answers to these petitions, as "Le Roy le voet", and "Le Roy s'avisera", although expressed in the king's name, were not actually given by the king alone; for "the Lords assent was as necessary as the Kings grannt or the Comons peticon". The answers to the petitions were considered and agreed upon by the lords before the legal stamp of approval, that is, the royal assent, was put upon them, for "bills had then the same essentiall forme of proceeding in the upper house with the Lords to prepare

[26] *Cf.* the method followed in Elsynge's printed book.

[27] Add. MS. 26643, ff. 4, 6$^{v}$, 8$^{v}$. These citations and those for most of the following paragraphs refer severally to particular quotations and statements in the paragraph.

them for the Royall Assent as is observed att this day". It is to be observed, however, that the author is able to cite no precedent directly proving this. The available precedents tend to show, on the contrary, that petitions were not always answered by the lords. Yet, in his words, he "found nowe and then an addicion in the Answere (more than was demmanded by the peticion & the Stattute drawen up accordingly . . . which made me resolve with myselfe that none of all these ancient bills were answered by the King alone". On the contrary, bills were read to the lords, committed, and voted upon, and there was a conference with the commons if amendments had been made in the answer, although "all these Ceremonyes are not mencioned in the anncient Records". Although bills were read to the lords before they were committed, yet it is to be doubted whether the modern practice of first and second readings before commitment and third after, and before the vote, obtained then, for "even in the dayes of Henry 8. Edward 6. & Queen Mary Bills were no oftener read than till the Lords were satisfied either to allowe or deny the same many being then read but twice & many about 3. or 4. tymes".[28]

Following the reading of the petition or bill, the next stage was consideration by a committee, "chosen out of the Kings privy Councell [in parliament] & the Judges & others somoned to treat with them". Although "You shall not finde this terme (Committment) in ancient parlement Rolles no where, yet nothing more frequenter appeares then than those Bills or Peticions were first considered of by the Kings Councell before they were assented unto by the Lords." This committee was appointed by the king himself and is to be distinguished from the receivers of private petitions. The committee on the commons' petitions was a special committee. When it was appointed is not certain; "att what tyme the King appointed the Comittee to annswer these publique Bills appears not in certaine for sometymes before the Subsidy grannt & sometymes afterwards". The report made to the lords by this committee was in no sense conclusive but required "their [the lords] opinion first & then their assent by Voate".[29] It is assumed that the answers reported by this committee, composed of the king's advisers, represented the wishes of the king. Yet frequently, and even in the presence of the king, the lords debated the answers to the petitions. "I have seene [says the author] the fragments of an ould Journall tempe H. 7. which directly sheweth that the King himselfe was present att the

[28] *Ibid.*, ff. 10, 10$^{v}$, 11, 12.

[29] *Ibid.*, ff. 13, 15$^{v}$, 18$^{v}$, 20$^{v}$.

debate of divers bills exhibited by the Comons".[30] After the report and the debate the lords gave their opinion individually by vote. The first recorded instance of this, as cited in this chapter, occurs in the seventeenth year of the reign of Edward III. In that year the commons presented a petition "touching forrein births of Englishmens children". The Archbishop of Canterbury "demannded of all the Prelats and Grands then present whether the infants of our Lord the King borne beyond the Seas shalbe enheritable in England. The which Prelats and Grands every one being examined by himselfe gave their Answere". A similar instance occurring in the twenty-first year of Richard II is described. The author concludes: "It were a very fond thinge to imagine that the Lords were any otherwise examined then by putting the Question unto them which they answered severally even as nowe."[31]

The answer, as reported by the committee and agreed upon by the lords, might be affirmative and yet might alter the petition presented by the commons by imposing a condition. In that case the general practice was for the lords to confer with the commons, "or att least [have] their Consent to the same [the amendment] before the Royall Assent came although it be seldome mencioned in the Record".

The procedure in the case of petitions of the clergy was somewhat different from that used in the case of commons' petitions. The former were often delivered separately from the commons' petitions by the prelates, and the statutes drawn upon them were made separately also. But after the reign of Edward III these clerical petitions ceased to be delivered separately. These petitions were exhibited in the lords' house, generally by the archbishop of Canterbury. The committee upon them consisted only of the temporal lords of the king's council. Petitions of the clergy, however, despite the special procedure sometimes used, required the consent of both the lords and the commons, which "is mencioned in all the Statuts for the Clergy though not particularly expressed in the Answers to their Peticons".[32]

The author next discusses the royal assent. He begins by explaining

[30] *Ibid.*, f. 21. It is possible that Elsynge here refers to the fragment of a journal mentioned by Sir Robert Cotton in *Cottoni Posthuma* (1672 ed.), pp. 53-54. Cotton there speaks of a journal which "preserves the passages of eight dayes in the twelfth year of his [Henry VII's] Raigne; in which the King was some dayes present at all debates". Cited by William Huse Dunham, jr., *The Fane Fragment of the 1461 Lords' Journal* (New Haven, 1935), p. 29. Professor Dunham believes that the fragment mentioned by Cotton is the Fane fragment of the 1461 lords' journal and that Cotton misdated it.

[31] Add. MS. 26643, ff. 26, 27.

[32] *Ibid.*, ff. 29, 38, 39, 41$^{v}$.

that this was not the answer to a petition which the king might give to the lords on the advice of his council. For this answer to the lords was not conclusive but might be debated, as has been said above. The royal assent, on the contrary, was conclusive and did not admit of debate. On the last day of the parliament the petitions and the king's answers to them were read in full parliament, and thus the royal assent was formally given. Thereupon the commons might leave the parliament. Emphasizing again that the answers to petitions were not the answers of the king alone, the author then explains that these answers were nevertheless given in the king's name because "none but the King can grannt a Lawe or the things required by the Comons (the Lords can only assent & soe ioyne with the Comons in their peticion) . . . . when his majesty is present [in parliament] all speeches unto the Lords and Comons are in His name, as cheefe of the parlement".[33]

The question of the king's denial is discussed next. Precedents from the reigns of Edward III and Richard II indicate that denials were then still given in direct negative words, "but in a fayre language as became the Lords and Judges of the Kings Councell in Parlement, who penned the same to the least discontent of the Comons". In the time of the former king the answer "Le Roy s'avisera" became common, however, and this in time came to replace a direct negative answer and served as the king's denial of a petition. At that time the lords and the council, in the frequent absence of the king, hesitated to give an answer to certain types of petitions, especially to those which concerned the king's interest or prerogative. They therefore gave the dilatory answer "Le Roy s'avisera", reserving a definite answer to his majesty. But "King Edward the third (in whose tyme these answers first began for aught I can finde to the contrary) being continually in warre, His Majesty very seldome thought of peticions soe referred unto him or His Councell had noe leasure or at least noe will to advise Him thereon. And soe in tyme *s'avisera* became as bad as the Kings denyall & noe other Answer given." The consent of the lords was thus implicit in the royal answer to a commons' petition, even though the answer was given in the king's name. Moreover, when once the lords had agreed upon an answer to a commons' petition, "it was not the practice of that Age to omitt or denye any Annswers (formerly agreed on by the Lords) when the King gave his Royall Assent". Yet there was no inconvenience for the king in this because the report on a commons' petition was made to the

[33] *Ibid.*, ff. 45, 47$^{v}$-48.

lords by the king's council, "the standing Comittee for all bills & they being apointed by the King". Should the lords alter the report to his dislike, then "the King did either forbeare to make a Stattute thereof or in penning the same (which was only done by His Majesty's Councell) some words were added or taken away to preserve the Kings right and the Lawes or else it was wholly omitted att his Majesty's pleasure as shalbe shewen hereafter, wherein will appeare many inconveniences to the people but none to the King". The author then points out that while in the past the king could give the answer "Le Roy le voet" to all petitions and then reconsider before any statute should be made, it would be very inconvenient for him now, "when the Bills are drawen up & exhibited in forme of a Statute & the Comittees apointed by the House & all agreed on & prepared for the Royal assent Rege inconsulto, & the Royal assent being once given they are published for Statuts immediatly".[34]

Having thus completed his discussion of the royal assent, the author turns next to ordinances or acts of parliament and statutes. Ordinances and acts are grouped together as synonymous, apparently, for the author says that "in some cases . . . the peticion & Answer did make an Ordinance of Parlement that is a good and perfect act of Parlement". There follows a discussion of what made an ordinance or act of parliament. In some cases the petition, together with the answer granting the prayer of the petition, "being read in full parlement & entred in the parlement Roll was reputed soe an Ordinance of parlement without penning the same in any other forme". In other cases the petition and answer as entered in the parliament roll were not sufficient to make the ordinance or act of effect, but the substance of the petition and answer must be "framed into an Act of Parlement", published in Westminster Hall, and entered in the statute roll. This was always true of bills which had their origin in the lords.[35]

Thus the act of parliament, that is the affirmative answer to a petition as made in parliament, might of itself be of legal effect. In some cases, however, it might lack validity until it had been written in the form of a statute and entered on the statute roll. Two factors must be considered in deciding this: first, whether the ordinance was private or public in character; and second, whether or not it changed the existing law of the realm. All private ordinances, even if they altered the law, were valid without being entered upon the statute roll. They depended

[34] *Ibid.*, ff. 49$^{v}$, 53$^{v}$, 58, 58$^{v}$, 59.
[35] *Ibid.*, ff. 60, 63, 64, 65.

for validity solely upon the assent of parliament, "ffor the Private Ordinance may bee a good & perfect Act of Parlement though it agree not with the Lawe then in being soe as it be made by assent of Parlement". In addition, any private ordinance which did not alter the law became valid with the assent of the king and the lords alone and did not need the assent of the commons. In the case of public ordinances, those which did not alter the existing law need not be written upon the statute roll but were immediately valid "soe soone as they were published in parlement, and as strong as if a Stattute were made thereon". On the other hand, public ordinances which did alter the law were not of effect until they had been published as statutes. Two reasons are given for this: first, that "all our Lawes & free Customes being forardly grannted & confirmed by Statutes they cannot be altered by an Ordinance which is of a lower nature"; and second, that while statutes received publication by proclamation, "whereby the Subiect may know how to direct his accons thereafter", ordinances not made into statutes did not generally receive publication by proclamation, and it would be "against Reason that such should alter the Law or Customes then in being & soe suddainly entrappe the Subiect unawares thereof". The only difference in force between an act of parliament in accord with the existing law and a statute was that such an act or ordinance could be repealed by another ordinance, while to repeal a statute another statute was needed. Yet an act of parliament in accord with the existing law had this advantage over a statute, that it "will receave a farre larger & a more favorable construcion than a Stattute for it is strengthened with the former lawes, whereas a Stattute pur Novel ley is to be construed strictly according to the words & meaning thereof haveing noe other former Lawe to assist it".[36]

The author then lists and discusses in turn the various forms of endorsement which a private ordinance might bear and which would testify to its validity. The terms "by assent of Parliament" and "in full Parliament" indicated that the answer to the petition had received the assent of the king, the lords, and the commons, though the use of the latter term, if the petition was of such nature that the commons' assent was not required, indicated the assent of the king and the lords only. The term "authoritate Parliamenti" also need not necessarily imply that the consent of the commons had been obtained to the answer so endorsed. The words were sometimes employed in the answer to a

[36] *Ibid.*, ff. 67, 72$^{v}$, 73, 79$^{v}$, 85, 86.

petition which had never been considered by the commons. Only if the commons had exhibited or presented the petition in question did "authoritate Parliamenti" include their assent. The terms "per ipsem Regem et totum Consilium in Parliamento" and "per peticionem in Parliamento" are in like case; they "doe only shew yt such an Act was grannted in parlement but they alone doe not prove ye Comon assent of parlement unlesse the same be specially mencioned".[37]

The author then discusses the important question of the publication of such acts or ordinances as were not made into statutes and thus automatically made public. Public ordinances which "were not contrary to the Lawes, usages or Customes then in being" were not usually published by proclamation. If such an ordinance related to commissions out of chancery, "ye Chancellor was present [at the making of the ordinance] & ought to take notice thereof—As for ye Subiect yt was divulged unto them by the Comons att their Returne into their Countyes". Likewise, "If the Ordnance concerned the Judges of either Bench or Barons of the Exchequer or Justices of Assize they were allsoe present & of the Kings Councell in parlement & therefore were to take notice thereof." Although sometimes these ordinances were exemplified and "sent to the Kings Courts to be enrolled", yet this was unnecessary, "for that they were according to the Lawe then in being" and made no change of which the subject ought to be informed. In any case, all acts of parliament were easily available to the subject because they were enrolled in the Rolls of Parliament, the "Treasury of these Publique Ordinances". In the case of private ordinances also, although they might alter or extend the existing law, publication by proclamation was not common. Usually they were exemplified or else they were published to the parties concerned by means of chancery writs "for the settling or confirmacion of that which was grannted unto them by parlement".[38]

The author then turns to a discussion of the making of statutes. Statutes were made, he says, not by the king, lords, and commons, but by the king and his council alone, with the assistance of "such Judges & others whom the King was pleased to call to assist his Councell herein". In connection with this point the author discusses whether or not a statute could be made in the absence of the king beyond the seas. Precedents from the reigns of Edward I, Edward III, and Henry V,

[37] *Ibid.*, ff. 90, 94, 94$^{v}$.
[38] *Ibid.*, ff. 95, 95$^{v}$, 96, 97$^{v}$, 99.

who were frequently absent from England, are cited, but these prove only that "Statuts have beene made in some of those parlements when the King hath beene beyond Seas & not in some others."[39]

As to the time when statutes were made, the author's conclusion is that, save on a few extraordinary occasions, they were made at the end of the parliament and after the engrossment of the parliament roll. Here there is a digression, in which precedents from the reigns of Edward III, Richard II, Henry V, and Henry VI are cited to show that the statutes sometimes contained matters not to be found in the enrolled petitions and answers on which they were supposedly based. The negligence of the engrossing clerk is suggested as an explanation of this: "yt may be thought that the Bills (thus omytted) were mislayed & not readily found when this man engrossed the Parlement Roll". When, however, the statute was made by the king's council, "the order was for the Clerke to bringe the Bills themselves aswell as the Roll before the Kings Councell & that they penned the Stattute out of the Originall not much regarding whether they were all entred into the Roll or not".[40]

The author's care to consult the available records is especially evident in his discussion of the form of the statute. Here he has compared the statutes with the original petitions and answers on which they were based. The comparison revealed considerable variation in the relationship between the statutes and the petitions and answers, for some of the chapters of a statute "were drawen out of the peticion alone, some out of the peticion & Answer and [some] out of the Answer alone". Comparison of the statutes and the relevant petitions and answers revealed, in addition, that the former often varied from the latter in form, though not greatly in substance. When the statute had been drawn up into chapters, it was approved by the king and then engrossed. Statutes usually were drawn up in the form of letters patent or "with a short Preamble that the things following were ordeined in parlement" and then sent with a writ to the sheriff of each county to be published.[41]

The final point discussed is of especial interest because of the author's obviously close acquaintance with the procedure on bills in his own day. It is a discussion of the "many inconveniences which happened to the Subiect by this anncient forme then used in penning and publishing of the Statute". These "inconveniences" were: first, that, despite the com-

[39] *Ibid.*, ff. 100$^{v}$, 113.
[40] *Ibid.*, f. 116.
[41] *Ibid.*, ff. 118$^{v}$, 119$^{v}$, 120, 132.

mon agreement on the answer to a petition, the statute required to put the answer into effect might never be made, for the making of statutes was in the hands of the king alone; secondly, because of this royal control and because statutes were made after the parliament, what had been agreed upon in parliament might be altered by omissions or additions in the statute; finally, as precedents from the time of Richard II and Edward II prove, there was the possibility that a statute might be made without the assent of either the lords or the commons. Examples of these "inconveniences" are given. But, concludes the author, these "inconveniences" are "remedyed by yt exact forme which is now used".[42]

Thus the chapter *Expedicio Billarum Antiquitus* describes a parliamentary procedure in many ways unlike and in other ways like that which Henry Elsynge himself knew. According to his account, legislation in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries took the form of petition and answer, and the petition was not yet drafted in the form of an act. Yet the consent of the lords was always required, and that of the commons in many cases, for the validity of ordinances or acts which changed the existing law. There was also in the lords' house essentially the same form of proceeding as Elsynge himself observed daily—the reading of the petition or bill, the commitment, the debate, and the final vote. It is clear that the motive of the author of this chapter was not only to describe the "ancient" procedure in the passing of bills but also to show, in the course of this description, the "ancient" power and jurisdiction of the lords in relation to the crown. That the lords were of old participants in the making of ordinances, though not in the making of statutes, is the inference clearly intended to be drawn from this account of medieval procedure.

CATHERINE STRATEMAN.

*White Plains.*

[42] *Ibid.*, ff. 133-139$^{v}$, 140.

# THE ATTITUDE OF BRITISH LABOR TOWARD PRESIDENT WILSON DURING THE PEACE CONFERENCE

THE appearance of Woodrow Wilson in England at the close of 1918 called forth a welcome which proclaimed how fully and completely the British Labor party had accepted the American President as its spokesman. Whether of the prowar majority or of the pacifist minority, its members were won by his espousal of the cause of a league of nations and the idealism of his peace program. When he departed for Paris, accordingly, their hopes for a just settlement and a new international order were centered on his ability to achieve them.[1] In the months that followed they anxiously watched his course, uncertain of his ability to cope with more experienced diplomats or to withstand the temptations of compromise. Their support did much to strengthen his position, and insofar as he was able to influence the peace terms, it was in no small part due to the knowledge of their backing. When, finally, he consented to a disappointing treaty, his leadership could not survive the reaction against him, but the principles he had enunciated in matchless language remained to set a standard and provide an inspiration for the future.

The enthusiasm of British Labor for the sponsor of those ideals was intensified by its fears of the alternative. Should Wilson fail, peace and reconstruction would fall into the hands of statesmen unbalanced by victory and discredited by the revelation of their secret treaties. Labor's confidence in Lloyd George disappeared in the general election, won on the slogan of "Hang the Kaiser and make Germany pay", while Clemenceau's frankly stated preference for alliances and strategic frontiers boded ill for future peace. Wilson alone appeared prescient, disinterested, and in quest of justice. To influence the settlement, therefore, Labor would strengthen his hands. As a prominent recruit wrote in the *Labour Leader:*

> Among those who are going to make it [the peace], we have one, and one only—President Wilson—whose ideals are broadly in harmony with ours as far as international affairs are concerned. If he fails to get them realized, the making of the peace falls back into the hands, not of the "Inter-

[1] See the author's "The Reaction of British Labor to the Policies of President Wilson during the World War", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVIII, 263-285. The materials used in the preparation of the present article, except for two items, are in the Hoover War Library at Stanford University.

national", but of men marked out by their secret treaties, their rejection of peace offers, their pettiness of spirit, their narrowness of view, their baseness of language, as the enemies of justice and democracy.

We must keep the making of the peace out of the hands of men like these. The only way to do it is to strengthen the hands of men like Wilson. . . . It is for us to see that he speaks at the Peace Conference, not as a single good man struggling with adversity, but as the spokesman of the will of the peoples.[2]

In accordance with these views the Labor party and the Trade Union Congress, representing the twofold aspect of the labor movement, sponsored a series of popular demonstrations. In all of them, beginning with one in Albert Hall, January 2, 1919, their reliance on the American President rather than on any British statesman was notable. It was in behalf of "a Wilson peace" that resolutions were adopted, and it was to him that messages of assurance and support were sent. In view of the strength of the forces of evil, his presence at Paris appeared providential.[3]

Once the negotiations at Paris were under way, these ardent followers were dismayed to learn that "open diplomacy" was to be interpreted less literally than had been expected. The first of the Fourteen Points was discarded. The responsibility for this reversion to the supposedly discredited "old diplomacy" was assumed to rest on the French and Italians. "We know that President Wilson is not to blame", wrote George Lansbury, editor of the *Herald*, from Paris.[4] Confidence returned with the holding of the first plenary session. As Wilson spoke in behalf of his peace ideals, his prestige appeared to be fully restored. Lansbury could write enthusiastically, "Here indeed is a man who is standing—and will stand to the very end—for the principles he believes in."[5] The *Herald* appeared with WILSON WINNING blazoned over the entire front page. Once more the President's eloquence, addressed to the world, carried the conviction that he was master of the situation.

This favorable impression was confirmed by Wilson's insistence that priority be granted to consideration of a league of nations. It was his advocacy of this cause in May, 1916, that had first rallied the British Labor and Socialist groups to his banner. His championship of it at

[2] Charles Roden Buxton, Jan. 2, 1919. In the same issue Mrs. Philip Snowden appealed to women to support President Wilson, "the best of the bourgeois, in his honest attempt to achieve the world's peace". All dates referred to in the footnotes are of the year 1919 unless otherwise indicated.

[3] *Labour Leader*, Jan. 9; *Herald*, Jan. 11; *New Statesman*, Feb. 1.

[4] *Herald*, Jan. 25. Lansbury had an interview with Wilson. George Lansbury, *My Life* (London, 1928), pp. 214-217.

[5] *Herald*, Feb. 1.

the conference as a practical issue produced such a quickening of hope that an enthusiastic Fabian could say: "A considerable slice of what has been called Utopia is in process of coming into being at the Peace Conference."[6] Wilson appeared as the man with a savior's mission. From Berne, where on February 2-9, 1919, the Labor and Socialist parties met in international conference for the first time since the outbreak of the war, Lansbury wrote: "It is astonishing how great is the faith of all in Wilson, how the most out-and-out Socialists recognize that while he is not one of us yet he is the one man capable of putting in the foundations for a true league of peoples."[7]

British Labor received the publication of the preliminary draft Covenant of the League on February 14 with mingled feelings. To some it appeared better than had been anticipated from the statesmen at Paris or even, more optimistically, "the most important single document that has ever seen the light of day".[8] For it the President could be thanked. Its inclusion in the peace treaty, as Wilson desired, was imperative, too, for it was "the essential steel-girder framework" on which the whole structure of the peace would be carried.[9]

From every section of the Labor movement, nevertheless, arose vehement criticism not only of minor details but also of major features of the plan. It was to be imposed ready-made on neutral and ex-enemy nations. Concentration of authority in the Council, to be dominated by the five great victorious powers, was denounced as an effort of the war alliance to perpetuate itself. A fundamental objection was that the League, based not on parliaments but on governments, would be an alliance of executives instead of a genuine league of peoples.[10] Some on

[6] *New Statesman,* Feb. 1. The Fabian Society, like the Independent Labor party and the British Socialist party, was a socialist organization affiliated with the Labor party. The voting strength of Labor, however, came from the trade unions.

[7] *Herald,* Feb. 15. The Berne conference favored a league with a central organ composed of delegates elected by the parliaments of affiliated countries and representative of all the parties therein, so as to insure a union of peoples rather than an alliance of governments, with all nations organized on a basis of self-determination eligible to membership on a footing of equality. *Labour Leader,* Mar. 13; *Times* (London), Apr. 2.

[8] Dr. J. Stirling Robertson ("Rob Roy") in *Forward,* Feb. 22.

[9] *New Statesman,* Mar. 22.

[10] The Labor and Socialist theory of a league with a democratic basis and minority representation appears in the debates and resolutions of the Berne conference (see note 7). President Wilson was cognizant of the validity of their views, as may be seen from an entry for February 12, 1919, in Colonel House's diary: "As a matter of fact, all labor and socialist organizations want just this [minority representation] and the President has done his best to meet it, but has been able to draw up nothing which seems to us practical." Charles Seymour, *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House* (Boston, 1928), IV, 313.

the left sensed a conspiracy. They believed that the League was designedly undemocratic, necessarily hostile to existing and future socialist states, and, potentially, a capitalist international. To them Wilson appeared so overcome by the noisome atmosphere of Paris that the proposed league was only a "grotesque burlesque" of his plan.[11]

These doubts with respect to the draft Covenant seldom extended to its chief sponsor, who was a recipient of sympathy rather than a target for criticism. Those who condemned it believed that it approximated his ideal no more closely than it did their own. He was regarded as conducting singlehanded a great fight against French, Italian, and even British reactionaries, who were anxious to keep the Covenant out of the treaty and postpone consideration of it until they had secured the territorial settlement they desired. On this point, however, Labor was confident that the President would never yield. WILSON WON'T appeared in heavy type on the front cover of the *Herald*.[12] If organized labor united behind him, a more satisfactory league might even yet be obtained. In this hope the Labor party and the Trade Union Congress united in calling a special conference, which met in London on April 3. Arthur Henderson expressed the prevailing point of view when he moved support of the League as a step in the right direction but said that the welcome would have been full and generous only if the Covenant had been consistent with the expectations aroused by the statesmen. The conference then adopted a series of twenty-three amendments intended to bring the League more into harmony with their ideal. Some were designed to center authority in the Assembly and base that body democratically upon the parliaments of constituent states, others to abolish conscription, provide for disarmament and for League control of arms manufacture, and strengthen the hands of the League in any threat of war; it was urged that Russia be invited and the League made all-inclusive, and, finally, that the Covenant should be an integral part of the treaty of peace.[13]

To meet these objections of Labor, as well as those from other sources, the Commission on the Covenant devoted several sessions to the revision of certain details. Proposals were advanced to meet the criticism that the League was not sufficiently democratic, but without result. The way was opened for the admission of Germany and Russia to permanent

[11] *Labour Leader*, Feb. 20-Mar. 13; *Herald*, *Forward*, and *Workers' Dreadnought*, Feb. 22.

[12] Mar. 22.

[13] *Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of the British Labour Party* (1919), pp. 23-25; *Labour Leader*, Apr. 10.

seats on the Council, but those slight concessions left unchanged the attitude of British Labor, in whose view the League would emerge woefully weak and defective, though it did offer something to build upon. Thanks to Wilson, the future was not entirely without promise, and an ordered world might eventually replace international anarchy. The editor of the *Daily Herald* could write: "It is to the credit of Wilson, and the other scorned 'idealists' who believe in the future of mankind, that they have been able to get the League into life as an expression of our common consciousness. That consciousness will grow."[14]

After securing the endorsement of the Peace Conference for the draft Covenant, Wilson left for America. The British Labor party watched his presentation of his case to the American people. His speeches at Boston and New York revived memories of his magnificent pronouncements during the war. They seemed to indicate a firm grasp of the situation and a grim determination to fight. Some uneasiness was manifest at the signs of hostility in the Senate and in the press, but it was assumed that he had the people with him. Wilson's Labor admirers could not foresee the strength of the opposition that was to develop to the President and the League.[15]

After Wilson's return to Paris on March 14 British Labor followed the revision of the Covenant and also the territorial and colonial adjustments, reparations, the blockade, and the Hungarian and Bavarian revolutions that soon complicated the scene. The Labor majority rejoiced at his return. He was their single hope of limiting French ambition on the Rhine, Italian in the Adriatic, and Polish in German lands; and he alone might save the fruits of the democratic revolutions in central and eastern Europe, for his statements about the "acid test" of sincerity with respect to Russia were never forgotten.[16]

On both wings of the party, however, there were small minorities more or less dubious of the President. The extreme right, which had become violently nationalist during the war, was suspicious of the United States, the proposed League, and a Wilsonian peace. They looked upon

[14] *Daily Herald,* Apr. 30. The *Herald* had become a daily on March 31.

[15] *Labour Leader* and *New Age,* Mar. 13; *Forward,* Mar. 15.

[16] *Labour Leader,* Mar. 13-20; *New Age,* May 8. In the *Labour Leader,* Apr. 3, Philip Snowden wrote: "If the intrigues and aims of France and Italy are successful President Wilson has only one honourable course open. He must go back to America sorrowfully admitting that his great ideal was too great, and that the narrow souls and the short-sighted vision of European statesmen make its realisation impossible for the present."

the United States as a nation which, with slight cost, had emerged from the war enormously wealthy and anxious to capture the commercial and naval supremacy of the world. The President, far from being a shortsighted pacifist or an altruistic visionary, was in reality a practical businessman intent upon furthering American interests. As a party politician he was not above sacrificing Allied security in Europe to gain the German vote in America. They accused him of delaying the peace by a dictatorial insistence upon his League, so that five months after the armistice no progress had been made on reparations, nor had a single frontier problem been solved. Henry M. Hyndman and Robert Blatchford, Socialists of the right, could now agree with ardent Tories that the conference suffered from "too much Wilson".[17]

On the extreme left were a small number of Marxists, some of whom were soon to form the British Communist party. Since all that mattered to them was the inevitable social revolution, they were little concerned with the politics of Paris. At best Wilson's efforts there were doomed to futility because society was plunging toward the cataclysm foretold by Marx; the persecutor of Eugene V. Debs was merely one representative at a conference of predatory capitalists; instead of being a prophet of the future, Wilson was only the last hope of American capitalism.[18]

Throughout April British Labor watched the developing struggle over Italy's claims. Except for the extreme right, which avowedly desired a punitive peace and sought material advantage from victory, the entire movement rejoiced at the President's display of firmness. The fate of Fiume, compared with that of the Saar valley, Danzig, or Shantung, might be of minor importance, but a successful stand there might result in the repulse of imperialism elsewhere. When the crisis came and Wilson published an open statement of his position, he momentarily recovered much of his former popularity. The Labor press and public once more rallied to him, while the responsible leaders united in a telegram of congratulation. At the same time they besought Lloyd George to continue his recent and gratifying support of the President's policy. Clemenceau was likewise notified of their position, and the Italian workers were urged to sustain the President. At the end of April Wilson's prestige was high.[19]

The President's recovery of lost ground was, nevertheless, incom-

[17] *Justice*, Mar. 6-Apr. 27; *Clarion*, Apr. 18; *British Citizen*, Apr. 3.

[18] J. T. Walton Newbold in the *Labour Leader*, Feb. 20-Mar. 13.

[19] *Daily Herald*, Apr. 25-26; *Labour Leader*, Apr. 10, May 1; *New Statesman*, Apr. 26; *Justice*, May 1.

plete. From the Labor point of view the Fourteen Points were being violated in so many respects that the insistence upon Fiume lost some of its force. He was not relieved of responsibility for the "barbarous" blockade of Germany nor for the Big Four's policy toward Russia. After a brief moment of hope from the Prinkipo conference proposal, there was a steady volume of protest against blockade and intervention from the trade unions, the Labor party, and the Labor press.[20] Some blame was placed upon the President when Rumanian pressure overturned Count Karolyi's Hungarian republic. Philip Snowden with his usual directness expressed the general fear that the Allies would inevitably be hostile to the revolutionary governments of central and eastern Europe: "Socialist Republics are a menace to Imperialist-Capitalist States. Therefore they must be ruthlessly crushed. And President Wilson is supporting these wars on Democracy. Under the acid test he is found to be dross." [21] Finally, rumors that Wilson had agreed to a military alliance with France and Great Britain administered a shock to those who had trusted to his reliance upon the League.

On May 8 the Labor party executive published a manifesto on the draft treaty, which had been presented to the Germans on the previous day. It revealed that the first impression made upon this body, dominated by moderate trade unionists, was that the treaty, unacceptable in part, might be adapted by the League, in accordance with Labor ideals, to the changing needs of Europe. The manifesto read:

> The National Executive of the Labour Party considers that the published summary of the Peace Treaty in some essential particulars is opposed to the declarations of President Wilson, the Inter-Allied [Labor and Socialist] Conferences, and the Berne Conference, is very defective from the standpoint of world peace, and bears evidence of compromise influenced by capitalist imperialism which still dominates the European states. . . . Only under the influence of the working class movement, organized in the International, can the imperfections of the present Treaty be completely eradicated and its provisions adapted by the League of Nations to the requirements of a changing European order. . . .[22]

Similar opinions were voiced in the Fabian *New Statesman,* which had supported the war, the idea of a league, and the President's program. Further on the right the militant nationalists approved the treaty

[20] *Daily Herald,* Apr. 14-15; *Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of the Labour Party* (1919), pp. 25-27.

[21] *Labour Leader,* May 8.

[22] *Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of the Labour Party* (1919), p. 216.

and rejoiced that Wilsonism had not led to undue leniency toward guilty Germany.[23]

From the Labor left, however, arose loud opposition to the settlement. The *Daily Herald* immediately led off with a double column editorial captioned "When There Is No Peace". The Allies had broken every pledge, and President Wilson, yielding to secret diplomacy, had lost his battle.

> President Wilson has been beaten. He set out with the pronouncement of high ideals. He forced the public acceptance of those ideals on the other Powers. But in secret they have beaten him. He has compromised on essentials, and, because of that, the details have gone astray. We pinned our faith to President Wilson. We believed in him. We do not judge him. We do not know what reasons he has had for abandoning "open covenants openly arrived at" for the sinister secrecy of Paris. What we do know is that from the moment he abandoned the first of his Fourteen Points he, in effect abandoned all.[24]

Day after day, assaults on the treaty continued. Columns were filled with unfavorable comparisons between the promises of the President's earlier speeches and the provisions of the treaty. Pages were devoted to devastating contrasts between the idealism of the Fourteen Points and the heavy demands on Germany. Manifestoes were signed by groups of Labor party intellectuals, Labor ex-soldiers, and organizations of or dominated by Labor men and women, such as the Union of Democratic Control, the National Peace Council, and the Berne Committee of Action. The pacifist Liberals, such as Arthur Ponsonby, C. P. Trevelyan, and E. D. Morel, who were now coming over to Labor, wrote furiously and bitterly against the treaty. In all these pronouncements, explicitly or by implication, President Wilson was regarded as having failed in the crisis.[25]

[23] *New Statesman*, May 10; *Seaman*, May 9; *Justice*, May 15; *British Citizen*, May 29; *Clarion*, May 30.

[24] *Daily Herald*, May 8.

[25] *Daily Herald*, May 9, 14, 21, 22, 24, June 30; *Labour Leader*, May 15, June 5, 26; Arthur Henderson, *The Peace Terms*, pp. 3-9. Points of the treaty most criticized were: the violations of the principles of nationality and self-determination; the Saar settlement; the Polish frontiers and corridor; the treatment of the German colonies as spoils of war; the punitive economic and impossible financial provisions; the one-sided disarmament; the omission of Germany from the League, the failure to base the League on parliaments, and the use of the League as the executor of a bad treaty. The treaty with Austria likewise could not stand the test of Wilson's principles: blocks of Germans were assigned to Italy and the succession states; the financial obligations could not possibly be executed; and the truncated Austria which emerged could not hope to survive.

The Independent Labor party (the I. L. P.), which had applauded "peace without victory", was unanimous against the treaty. Its executive immediately, on May 8, denounced it as "a capitalist, militarist, and imperialist imposition" that violated every public statement of Allied war aims.[26] It was "a masterpiece of predatory Imperialism".[27] According to Philip Snowden, Wilson's Fourteen Points had been treated with callous contempt and turned into vindictive, brutal, and crushing terms. As to the President, he was "the broken reed", and upon him Snowden wasted no charity.

> Beyond all the other statesmen who are responsible for the Peace Treaty President Wilson is utterly discredited. He has not insisted upon the observance of a single one of the conditions of peace he has laid down. The League of Nations, to which he professed to attach so much importance, is nothing but a militarist organization to enforce aggressive and imperialist conditions. His intervention in the European War has been disastrous from every point of view. If he had not brought America into the War a decent peace would probably have been secured. His intervention has intensely aggravated the European situation, and has left Europe seething with jealousies, hatred, malice, and the certainty of a generation of war and bloodshed. The sooner he gets back to America and ceases to interfere in international politics, for which he has evidently neither the courage nor the knowledge, the better it will be for the peace of the world. If history makes any comment upon his statesmanship it will be to condemn him as the weakest and most incompetent person whom a malignant fate ever entrusted with the power to interfere in human affairs.[28]

Not all members of the I. L. P. were so scornful of the man who in their opinion had failed them. He had been beaten and had yielded, but, however pitiable the end, it had been "a high adventure" in which he had sometimes fought well.[29] Even Philip Snowden, in response to inquiries as to possible methods of exerting pressure at Paris, could only advise his readers to write to Wilson.[30]

The left point of view quickly permeated the Labor center. Elements that at first overlooked much in their enthusiasm for the League and the righting of some obvious wrongs became much disquieted. "The treaty as a whole is not defensible", said the *New Statesman* on second thought, and "as one re-reads it the hope of founding a real League of Nations on the basis of such a peace fades into a very far-off future".

[26] *Report of the Twenty-eighth Annual Conference of the Independent Labour Party* (1920), pp. 9-10.

[27] H. N. Brailsford in the *Daily Herald*, May 21.

[28] *Labour Leader*, May 22.

[29] J. Ramsay MacDonald in *Forward*, May 31.

[30] *Labour Leader*, May 29.

With respect to the German counterproposals this journal said that for the first time in nearly five years it was compelled to admit that justice was no longer on the side of the Allies but on that of "the Huns".[31] Arthur Henderson, as secretary of the Labor party, issued a statement that neither the policy of President Wilson nor that of British Labor had yet triumphed.[32] The Labor party point of view became so nearly unanimous that the executive committee was moved to reconsider its first hasty manifesto. On June 1, jointly with the Parliamentary Labor party, it issued a strong statement condemning the treaty as defective not because of details, which might be corrected, but because it was fundamentally wrong in that it was based upon the very principles which had produced the war. It was denounced as a flagrant violation of the pledges of Wilson and Allied statesmen and of the war aims of Labor.[33] The trade unionist majority was in harmony with the socialist left in the belief that the treaty could not be made the basis of an enduring peace.

This agreement was apparent at the annual conference of the Labor party which opened at Southport on June 25, the day on which the *Times* published the full text of the treaty, and closed on June 27, the day before the signature at Versailles. The resolution on the peace was moved by J. Ramsay MacDonald of the I. L. P., seconded by J. R. Clynes, a former member of the Coalition Government, and carried with enthusiasm. It urged the completion of the League by the prompt admission of Germany and the utilization of that agency to further the speedy revision of the harsh terms of the treaty, which were so inconsistent with Allied pretensions. International labor should undertake a vigorous campaign for the popular support of this policy. The name of Wilson no longer appeared as a symbol of their creed in the resolutions of a disillusioned Labor party, but his League, even though weak and unsatisfactory as the treaty made it, opened a vista of promise.[34]

The sentiment of the rank and file was not accurately reflected in

[31] *New Statesman*, May 17, 31.

[32] *The Workers' Dreadnought*, May 31.

[33] *Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of the Labour Party* (1919), p. 217.

[34] *Ibid.*, pp. 139-142. During the conference there was one disparaging reference to President Wilson when Neil McLean, a delegate from the British Socialist party, characterized him as "a commercial traveller for American Capitalism", who had brought America into the war to save the millions lent to the allies. He assailed the Labor executive for sending a telegram of congratulations to one who left Socialists and Labor men in prison in his own country. Arthur Henderson reminded McLean that the telegram in question was sent at a time (December, 1918) when they were hopeful that through Wilson they might realize the ideals that British Labor held in common with him. *Ibid.*, pp. 115-116.

the House of Commons. In the "coupon" election of December, 1918, the most effective spokesmen, especially those of the I. L. P., suffered defeat, so that under the chairmanship of William Adamson the parliamentary group were operating at their lowest efficiency. While the treaty was in the making they, unlike the party press, were almost silent. Except for a warning on March 5 from J. H. Thomas on the dangers inherent in any punitive settlement,[35] they had scarcely an idea to offer on peace and reconstruction. On the first reading of the bill to approve the treaty, on July 3, Adamson spoke briefly. At a time when the party was most vigorous in its denunciation of the bases of the treaty and specific in its criticism of details, Adamson could only indicate that in certain features the document was unacceptable. In spite of the temper of the party conference and a memorandum prepared by Labor's Advisory Committee on International Questions, his position was still that of the first manifesto issued by the executive. There was much criticism of Adamson, although it was softened somewhat by his hint of a fuller statement later.[36] At the second reading, on July 21, Clynes made a somewhat more effective presentation of Labor views, but some outspoken independent Liberals suited the party much better. On the final vote most of the Labor members were absent, and of the half dozen members of the House of Commons who opposed the treaty only one was of their number.[37] This inactivity was roundly criticised at the party conferences.[38]

During the latter part of 1919 British Labor watched President Wilson's campaign in behalf of the Covenant in the United States. Few believed that the opposition, whose outlook appeared to them so selfish and parochial, could prevail against his appeal. To the many who saw in the League the one hope of salvation for the world, the President's failure was as tragic as his physical collapse was pathetic. It seemed that a singular nemesis had overtaken Wilson. After setting his signature to a bad peace in the hope that the League would provide the agency for its redemption, the refusal of his own country to enter it now jeopardized everything.[39]

[35] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th ser., CXIII, 545-550.

[36] *Ibid.*, CXVII, 1232-1233.

[37] *Ibid.*, CXVIII, 958-965, 1115.

[38] *Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of the Labour Party* (1919), pp. 127-132; *Report of the Twentieth Annual Conference of the Labour Party* (1920), pp. 147-156.

[39] *New Statesman*, July 19, Sept. 6-13, Nov. 22, Dec. 16, Jan. 3, 1920; ***Forward***, Oct. 25, Nov. 29; *Labour Leader*, Sept. 25, Dec. 11-18; ***British Citizen***, Sept. 13, Oct. 18; *Daily Herald*, June 12, Oct. 30.

Somewhat more than four years later the first Labor Government of Ramsay MacDonald held office in Great Britain. Even as they prepared to grapple with problems left or created by the treaty makers, word came of the death of ex-President Wilson. The many expressions of regret at his passing were mingled with appraisals of his record and comments upon his failure. It was not forgotten, however, that on him the Labor party and international socialism had once rested their hopes, and if they had apparently been dashed so low, it was because he had raised them so high. The following paragraph is, perhaps, a fair estimate of the results of Woodrow Wilson's presence at Paris as seen in retrospect through the eyes of British Labor:

> Everyone speaks easily of "the tragic failure of Wilson". But no purpose is served by distorting the degree of that failure. If Wilson had raised hopes less ardent it is doubtful whether we should commonly talk now of his failure. The vestiges of his work are all important. Europe is still building on what he left, and its task—MacDonald's task—might be immeasurably greater but for those vestiges. The Fourteen Points, the League of Nations, the pre-Armistice terms—these things may be but names and shadows. But they are names and shadows which haunt the conscience of Europe: the ghosts that will not be banished from the bitter "feasts" of the conquerors. If the Treaty of Versailles or the League or the Reparation terms stand out in the sum total as a monstrous hypocrisy it is largely because the world is obliged to measure those things, whether it will or not, by the promises that were implied, the standard that was set by Wilson.[40]

Carl F. Brand.

*Stanford University.*

[40] H. N. Brailsford in the *New Leader*, Feb. 8, 1924.

## NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

### The Federal Archives of New York City

#### OPPORTUNITIES FOR HISTORICAL RESEARCH

#### I

In an extensive list of American research projects compiled in 1934 [1] half a dozen or so seem to have been suggested by the available archival sources in federal repositories and only one or two by the federal records outside the District of Columbia. It is true that American historical scholars, as compared with those overseas, have been greatly handicapped in the use of government records. Until very recently no centralized archival repository comparable to the British Public Record Office existed in this country. The federal character of our political system, the fact that our political and economic capitals are not one and the same, and the unusually wide distribution of the major agencies of the federal government, all make for a complicated archival situation. On the other hand, no such rigid regulations as obtain abroad, as to conditions under which government records are open to inspection, exist generally in our federal offices. The American departments set dates more recent than do the British [2] for opening their records to the public, though no uniform policy in this matter has been adopted.

The establishment of the National Archives was a step of first importance in organizing and centralizing the older public records of the federal government and in insuring their future care and preservation. The act creating the National Archives empowered the Archivist of the United States to inspect personally or by deputy the records "of any agency of the United States Government whatsoever and wheresoever located".[3] Under the authority of this act a preliminary survey was made of government records within the District of Columbia. It was soon deemed essential to supplement this survey with an investigation of federal archives located outside the District, and there was organized

[1] *List of Research Projects in History*, supplement to *Am. Hist. Rev.*, vol. XXXIX, no. 3.

[2] See V. A. Galbraith, *An Introduction to the Use of the Public Records* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 104-106.

[3] 48 *U. S. Statutes at Large*, 1122, § 3.

in January, 1936, the Survey of Federal Archives, sponsored and directed by the National Archives and financed with an appropriation substantial in amount from the Works Progress Administration. The Survey proposed to report on the content, condition, quantity, and location of the federal records, with special attention to material deemed of historical significance. Dr. Philip M. Hamer, now Chief of the Division of the Library of the National Archives, was appointed National Director of the Survey, and the entire country was divided into thirty-four administrative regions, headed by regional directors responsible for the supervision of the work of a staff of approximately three thousand persons, selected in accord with the regulations of the Works Progress Administration. It is expected that the detailed results of this investigation will ultimately be embodied in a Guide to the Federal Archives, now in course of compilation by the staff of the Survey.

While any attempt to present the results of this nationwide survey would be premature at this time, typical conclusions can be drawn from the intensive investigation that is still in operation in the city of New York. It is estimated that of the total volume of federal records outside of the city of Washington approximately twenty per cent are located in New York City. The staff which began operations in New York City last March has completed an examination of approximately one half million linear feet of records and prepared reports covering twenty thousand separate collections of materials.[4] Previous surveys have suggested possibilities for the historical investigator in the federal records in New York City, but in none of these are the individual collections reported on in any detail, nor are the scattered and miscellaneous offices of the government examined.[5]

[4] Excluding post-office substations and the multitude of Works Progress Administration offices, there are 466 federal units in New York City. While the records are scattered in hundreds of locations throughout the five boroughs, the principal buildings housing Federal archives are: the Custom House, Bowling Green (Treasury and Commerce); the federal Court House, Foley Square (Judiciary and Justice); the Federal Building, Christopher Street (Treasury, Labor, War, Navy, etc.); the Administration Building, Ellis Island (Labor); the Navy Yard, Brooklyn (Navy); the Army Building, Whitehall Street, the Staff Headquarters of the 2d Corps Area and Fort Jay on Governor's Island, and the Army Base, Brooklyn (War); the Department of the Interior Building, 45 Broadway (Commerce and miscellaneous); the Federal Building, Washington Street, Brooklyn (Post Office, Judiciary, Justice, Treasury, etc.); the General Post Office and the Morgan Annex (Post Office, Treasury, and miscellaneous); the Assay Office, Old Slip (Treasury); the Sub-Treasury, Wall Street (State and miscellaneous).

[5] (a) Primarily treating municipal, county, and local material are Herbert L. Osgood, "Report on the Public Archives of New York", American Historical Association, *Annual*

In general it may be said for New York City that the most important federal archives from a historical standpoint will be found in the custody of the courts and the Department of Justice, on the one hand, and in the Customs Bureau of the Treasury Department, on the other.[6]

## II

The oldest material in the federal archives of New York City is located in the District Court for the Southern District of New York at the Federal Court House. This is the collection of records of the Vice-Admiralty Court of the province of New York, and of the Court of Admiralty of the state of New York, 1701–1788. While some of this material was edited by the late Judge Charles Merrill Hough, much of historical importance was not included in this collection, and many important admiralty papers unknown to the learned editor have been uncovered by the staff of the Survey.[7] They comprise twelve boxes of papers, one exhibit book, and three minute books, 1701 to 1788.[8] This material is of first importance for an understanding of the eighteenth century law of admiralty, prize, customs, salvage, mariners' wages, etc. Alexander Hamilton appears as proctor in a number of cases in 1784 and 1785. Among the unusual material unknown to Judge Hough and

*Report*, 1900, II, 67-250, and V. H. Paltsits, "Bibliography" (embracing reports on New York City archives, ecclesiastical records, manuscripts in libraries), in I. N. Phelps Stokes, *Iconography of Manhattan Island* (New York, 1916-1928), vol. VI. (b) A survey of both published records and archival material, principally in the large semipublic institutions, such as libraries and learned societies, with briefer attention to the public records is E. B. Greene and R. B. Morris, *A Guide to the Principal Sources for Early American History, 1600 to 1800, in the City of New York* (New York, 1929). (c) Exclusively devoted to an account of federal records is the report of the Librarian of Congress of 1913 entitled "Archives of Government Offices outside of the City of Washington" (*House Document*, 62 Cong., 2 sess., no. 143). This is fragmentary in character and based upon responses made by custodians of archives to a questionnaire submitted. It is of very limited value for the investigator. See also A. R. Newsome, "Unprinted Public Archives of the Post-Colonial Period: their Availability", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXIX, 682-689.

[6] Federal court records are not the only neglected sources of social history, for American historians in the past have been equally neglectful of state and local judicial records. See Roscoe Pound, "New Possibilities of Old Materials of American Legal History", *West Virginia Law Quarterly*, XL (Apr., 1934), 205-211; R. B. Morris, "The Sources of Early American Law: Colonial Period", *ibid.*, pp. 212-223.

[7] *Reports of Cases in the Vice-Admiralty of the Province of New York* (New Haven, 1925). Hough's edition represents less than forty per cent of the total papers available. From some points of view the basis of selection may be questioned, as prize and salvage cases appear to have been heavily stressed by the editor, and customs and wage litigation cavalierly treated.

[8] A supplementary minute book has recently been uncovered in the manuscript room of the New York Public Library for the years 1757 to 1784.

not included in the general treatments of colonial piracy are the documents dealing with the apprehension of the pirates, Richard Caverley and Jeremiah Higgins, by the New York authorities in 1717. The depositions depict a series of raids, forceful detention of crews, plundering, burning and seizing of vessels on the high seas, from the West Indies as far as the northern coast of Maine. This fascinating account of maritime lawlessness supplements the information relating to the depredations of the *Whiddah,* generally known to historians of the period.[9]

The records of the federal courts contain information on the unofficial war between the United States and France, 1798–1801. A notable instance is the case of the cutter *Le Gourdi le Pelicain,* which left Haiti in 1798, apparently clandestinely commissioned, was captured by pirates who murdered the crew and male passengers, then seized as a prize by a French lugger, and finally was captured by two American warships, the frigate *Boston* and the sloop *Norfolk,* which sank the privateer. The seizure was executed under orders authorizing the capture of any French vessel found near the coast preying upon American commerce.[10]

Material of unusual value for the historian, hitherto unexploited, has been found among papers dealing with the Embargo preceding the War of 1812, and those relating to the blockade during the Civil War. While the Embargo papers are less extensive and illuminating than those relating to the Civil War, they shed much light on the maritime history of the period. The papers for the period of the Civil War expose in detail machinery for the judgment of prizes and blockade-runners. Depositions in such cases were taken before the United States Prize Commissioner's Office, Southern District of New York, and from such material useful statistics can be drawn as to the place of capture, destination of the ship, nature of the cargo, nationality of the ship, crew, and owners, and as to the nature of the contraband, if any. These depositions often give valuable information concerning the conditions of the blockade—the nature of the contracts between blockade-running captains and cargo owners and the tactics of the blockade-runners. Occasionally, letters and other papers are included among the records which shed a good deal of light on Civil War conditions.[11] Most notable in the collec-

[9] See J. Franklin Jameson, *Privateering and Piracy in the Colonial Period* (New York, 1923), pp. 290-311.

[10] See also Thomas Harris, *The Life and Service of Commodore William Bainbridge, U. S. N.* (Philadelphia, 1837), pp. 39-40. See also "Letters of Toussaint Louverture and of Edward Stevens, 1798-1800", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XVI, 90.

[11] In the case of the *Annie,* a blockade-runner sailing under English colors and

tion are the papers in the cases of the *Springbok* and the *Peterhoff*, which established the doctrine of continuous voyage.[12] Of further interest in the Civil War period are the references in the register of the United States Prize Commissioner, Southern District, 1861–1865, to the need of gunboat protection against the Brooklyn riots.

The illicit slave trade between 1843 and 1858 is the subject of an extensive collection of papers in the case of the ship *Chancellor*. The normal practice was for the federal attorney to institute criminal proceedings against both captain and crew and to arrange for the seizure and confiscation of ship and cargo.

For the period of the World War the relevant papers in the federal courts fall into three categories: (1) Prosecution for violations of neutrality and of enemy aliens for various causes. Examples include a number of cases in admiralty, found in the Eastern District Court, growing out of the Black Tom Explosions, July 30, 1916, as well as a miscellaneous collection of prosecutions found in the files of both district courts involving the summary arrest of enemy aliens for alleged espionage, fomenting

captured at New Inlet, North Carolina in October, 1864, letters in the court file are found from people in the South attempting to communicate with friends and relatives. For example, G. W. Woodruff wrote his mother in London in 1864: "I have never put up with greater hardships than during my journey to and from General Hood's Army. No words can express the misery of Railroad travelling in the Confederate States at this time. The cars are filthily dirty, and are generally filled with very dirty soldiers and the pace averages about ten miles an hour. . . . Sherman as you have heard by this time, ordered every Confederate out of Atlanta when he occupied the town and has reduced the people to the greatest misery. Hundreds of them have nowhere on earth to go to and are very glad to live on Railroad luggage vans. Nobody, unless they have seen it, can imagine the misery the people of this country are in and what hardships they have to put up with. . . . When I left England you will recall the general opinion that was that the war would be over this year. Now I do not think there is much chance of its being over for some years to come. . . . As for subduing the South, that will be an impossibility for the North to accomplish, as they will fight 'til the last man drops and then if they cannot keep up regular Armies they will carry on a Guerilla warfare to the end of time rather than give in." See also the letter of Lt. Col. Bell, 1862, relative to destitution in St. Augustine, which is included among the papers of the *British Empire* case.

[12] Among the *Onachita* papers (1862) is a letter of instructions to the captain, stating in part: "You had better however not trust to your being in ballast and to the legal character of your voyage—bound from one British Port to another British Port—for protection, as the Yankee Cruisers do as they please and our Government consigns all the cases to the tedious process of their Admiralty Courts". Among other papers seized on the blockade-runners is a letter to Confederate Commissioner Mason, dated March 5, 1862, from the agents of the Liverpool and New Orleans Mail Steam Navigation Company stating terms for providing the Confederate States with the services of the *Alabama, Florida,* and *Louisiana.*

labor trouble, using fraudulent passports, etc.[13] (2) Prosecutions for criminal syndicalism. Examples here include the better-known trials under the Espionage acts of 1917-1918.[14] These cases are deserving of careful review by students of the violation of constitutional safeguards during war time. (3) Papers relating to the sinking of the *Lusitania.* These include a copy of the cargo manifest, the original of which is in the files of the Deputy Collector of the Port at the Custom House and considered strictly confidential, and other records bearing on the petition of the Cunard Steamship Company for limitation of its liability.[15]

The antitrust prosecutions take front rank among the historical records of the federal courts. While such leading twentieth century antitrust suits as the Standard Oil Case and the American Tobacco Case are familiar to historians through the published repor s, an examination of the full files of unpublished papers in such cases would even at this date reward the investigator. Other business of the federal courts, such as copyright and patent litigation, often involves material of secondary historical interest.[16] The patent suits are an almost untapped mine of

[13] These papers indicate that no consistent policy was adopted by the courts with reference to enemy aliens and reveal such wartime laxities as the surprising ease with which enemy aliens secured work in various military training camps provided they had registration cards. Among the more important cases may be cited U. S. *v.* Hamburg American Steamship Line (1916), involving violations of neutrality by neutral ships leaving American ports in order to supply German cruisers, and fully substantiating the charges of British Ambassador Cecil Spring-Rice. The defendants were indicted and convicted for filing false manifests relevant to the cargo and destination of vessels. In addition there should be mentioned the series of criminal cases brought for various German bomb conspiracies, including the prosecution in 1914-1915 of Franz von Papen *et al.* for conspiring to blow up the Welland Canal, of Walter T. Scheele *et al.* for conspiring to secrete bombs on munition ships sailing from New York to allied countries, and of Robert Fay *et al.* for conspiring to destroy allied ships. Von Papen's role in this plot seems inconsistent in the light of his fantastic activities of the following year.

[14] U. S. *v.* Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman; same *v.* Kramer, Becker, *et al;* same *v.* Prober *et al;* same *v.* the Masses Publication Company; same *v.* Scott Nearing and the American Socialist Society.

[15] The principal munitions items were mentioned by Thomas A. Bailey, "The Sinking of the *Lusitania*", *Am. Hist. Rev.,* XLI, 54-73. Mr. Bailey examined a photostatic reproduction of the manifest but does not appear to have consulted the files in New York City. The evidence of the manifest is corroborated by receipts for the munitions, to be found among the exhibits at the New York trial. There is also included in these papers a sealed package labeled "*Lusitania* briefs not to be opened without order of Court".

[16] Of interest to the literary historian are such choice morsels in the Eastern District Court as a suit brought by Augustin Daly against William Sinn in 1878 making theatrical law and related to the well-known piracy suits involving Boucicault; the action brought in 1896 by Oliver Wendell Holmes, jr., for infringement of copyright of his father's

information on the history of applied science and invention. The files are especially full on camera and motion picture patent litigation.

In addition to the large quantity of naturalization papers available in the state and county courts of record, the naturalization papers of the District Court are to be found in the Federal Building for the years 1814–1855. Large quantities of miscellaneous papers in the federal courts will reward the patient sifting of the historian.[17] Outstanding among these are the papers in equity relating to land speculation in the early federal period, including the extensive litigation in the District Court in which the Holland Land Company sought to protect its equity in Robert Morris's lands.[18]

## III

We pass now to the customs records. The Custom House probably contains the largest collection of federal archives in any single building outside of Washington. To this collection the world-wide commercial and maritime position of New York City lends special historical and statistical importance. The fact that many of these records are in poor condition and face eventual, in some cases speedy, destruction should be the special concern of American historical scholars. The bulk of the noncurrent records are located in a huge subbasement which also houses a steam plant and an emergency boiler plant and serves for the storage of office furniture, janitorial supplies, and other miscellaneous objects. It is without ventilation, insufficiently lighted, and constitutes an ever-present fire hazard. In addition to papers deposited in metal stacks, huge piles of noncurrent material are heaped in "dumps"

*Autocrat of the Breakfast-Table;* and the famous suit instituted in 1899 by Rudyard Kipling against Putnam's and others for pirating an edition of his works.

[17] Among these may be mentioned the suit brought in 1872 by the sultan of Turkey against the Providence Tool Company, revealing that four or five years before the Russo-Turkish War, Turkey was preparing for any eventuality. In the suit in equity begun in 1905 by the Order of Carthusian Monks against the Cusenier Company for an injunction to restrain it from using the name "Chartreuse" in connection with any liqueur or cordial it might manufacture, will be found documentary material, which should be of interest to medievalists, relating to the early history of the Carthusian Fathers and their industrial activities, and also to the effect of the French Law of Associations upon the religious order's world-wide economic activities, the latter largely based on the testimony of Alexandre Millerand.

[18] Another interesting suit relates to holdings in East Florida, where the plaintiff, Jasper Ward, brought suit in New York in 1824, though the sale was consummated in Havana, alleging that the courts of Cuba were not only dilatory "but oftentimes corrupt" and that "immunities and protection from legal coercion are not infrequently obtained from the government and officers of the Court of Spain".

awaiting permission for sale and destruction. These "dumps" are affectionately referred to as Mts. Vesuvius and Aetna. They are enormous in size, weighing in all approximately twenty tons and occupying about six thousand cubic feet.

Despite the huge collection of Treasury and Commerce papers in the Custom House, there are serious gaps in the collections. For example, except for some material for the early 1790's, ship manifests are almost completely lacking for the first part of the nineteenth century. One manuscript dealer in New York City has in his possession an extensive collection of ship manifests for the port of New York, covering the years 1790-1810, which appear to have been disposed of for waste paper at a public sale conducted by the Barge Office some thirty years ago. At the Easthampton Public Library the writer located a customs register of New York City for the years 1799–1800. The large gaps in the records are owing in part to the failure of nineteenth century collectors of the port to recognize the historical value of this material, in part to the limited facilities available for the storage of so huge a mass of papers, and in large measure to careless moving and handling during the many peregrinations of the Custom House since 1784.[19]

Important material is to be found, nevertheless, in the Custom House, dating from the earliest federal period and including a record of foreign arrivals and a register of vessels, both beginning in 1789, and an index of foreign clearances, beginning in 1798. An extensive collection of crew lists beginning in 1803 has been the source of illuminating statistical data compiled by the Survey on the relative proportion of Americans to foreigners in the merchant marine service.[20] Of historical interest also is the collection of shipping articles, 1840–1914. The log of the privateer *Favourite,* covering a period of six months during 1813, should be of interest to students of the naval history of our second war with Great Britain.

For the period following the Civil War the customs records are fuller in character and offer a rich field for the historical explorer. Among the items of importance are the files of the Collector of Customs

[19] Between 1784, when the Custom House was established in the lower part of General John Lamb's dwelling house on Wall Street, and 1907, when the present structure was first occupied, the customs records have been moved at least nine times. See Stokes, *Iconography of Manhattan Island,* V, 1543, 1699, 1712, 1721-1722, and MS. letter of M. M. Noah to Asbury Dickens, July 15, 1833, New York Public Library.

[20] Between 1803 and 1819 there are numerous lacunae: the years 1806 and 1818 are missing entirely; from 1819 the lists are complete.

regarding appointments in the customs service, tenure, etc., 1863 to date; executive papers from President Lincoln prohibiting the exportation of munitions from the United States; and letter books from the Naval Office containing correspondence between the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and the Collector, and material on the collection of duties under reciprocity treaties and on discriminatory and refunded duties under special treaties. Of special value to the economic historian of recent trends is the extensive collection of outward foreign manifests, January, 1917-December, 1918, covering the period of America's participation in the World War, and July, 1922-June, 1927, as well as a group of inward foreign manifests, January, 1922-August, 1931. The staff of the Survey has compiled for Customs District No. 10 statistics on the enforcement of the Anti-Dumping Act of 1922. The conclusions indicate that less than ten per cent of the "dumping" complaints brought by American business men were substantiated by the Secretary of the Treasury. A painstaking study of the Anti-Dumping Unit, of the weekly reports of the Liquidating Division, and of the quarterly reports of the Auditor of the Money and Accounts Division should add much to the standard accounts, such as Jacob Viner's. Among material of regional interest which maritime historians have not utilized is a large collection of the records of the old Long Island ports and of Albany, Troy, and Perth Amboy, which are in the custody of the Marine Division. The Long Island records, some of which go back to 1753, are of great value to the student of the whaling industry.[21]

An unusual item in the custody of the Marine Division is a set of letters sent by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Collector in New York authorizing the shipment of arms and ammunition to Mexico in accordance with President Taft's proclamation of March 14, 1912. Included in these orders are records of shipments of munitions for the

[21] These records comprise principally ships' registers, crew lists, masters' oaths and licenses, ships' mortgages, bills of sale, etc., and are available as follows: Greenport, 1854-1922; Sag Harbor, 1830-1919; Port Jefferson, 1858-1910; Cold Spring Harbor, 1865-1913; Patchogue, 1875-1922; Troy, 1842-1879; Albany, 1833-1923, scattering; Perth Amboy, 1870-1922. Apparently, when the ports of entry on Long Island were closed, all records were not turned over to the New York City authorities, as the writer has located in private hands at Sag Harbor a number of ships' papers bearing signatures of Washington, Jefferson, etc., a record of customs dues for 1804, and a crew book for 1830. This may in part be explained by the fact that surveyors or naval officers of the subports were merely part-time employees, had other business activities on the side, such as keeping a grocery store, etc., and their private business accounts would often loom larger in the daily scheme than the customs records.

use of the American colony in Mexico City in 1912 and for the German and Japanese colonies in the following year. Du Pont, Bethlehem, Remington Arms, Winchester, Colt's, and many lesser firms were involved in this trade. This collection should be of interest not alone to students of Latin-American relations but also to investigators of the role of munition makers in our past wars.

Among the papers of historical interest in the custody of the Division of Foreign Trade Statistics of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is a collection of blotters of imports for immediate consumption, January, 1923-January, 1930,[22] and of blotters of withdrawals from bonded warehouses for consumption, November, 1922-January, 1930.[23] This material, entirely in code, can be used profitably by statisticians interested in examining the expansion and contraction of American foreign trade during our most recent economic cycle.[24]

Closely related to the Custom House material is the collection at the Barge Office. Of special historical interest are the records of the Customs Intelligence Bureau for the years 1918 and 1919. Organized to enforce the provisions of the Espionage Act and the Trading with the Enemy Act relating to the prevention and detention of persons, merchandise, letters, etc., entering or leaving the United States contrary to law, this bureau has preserved suspect books of persons deemed dangerous to the public safety, lists of seamen who had lost their identification papers—a record made to prevent the use of such papers by enemy spies—and material relating to the Customs censorship and to the activity of German agents in the United States.

The records of the New York office of the United States Shipping Board contain important related items dealing with the history of the port of New York and maritime affairs generally. No thorough study of the history of safety legislation on the high seas could afford to overlook the reports of casualties at sea, 1891 to date. Other items of historical interest are an extensive collection of early log books, 1817–1910; a collection of decisions on the shipment of munitions on passenger ships, 1911 to date; a record of prices and purchasers of scrapped merchant fleet ships, 1925 to the present; and full histories of each ship leased

[22] September to December, 1922, and the entire year 1924 are missing.

[23] September, October, 1922, missing.

[24] The Survey of Federal Archives sent this material to the National Archives in October, 1936. Summaries of the information contained therein are available in *Commerce and Navigation of the United States*, the annual publication of the Department of Commerce.

by the Merchant Fleet Corporation to private companies since 1925. The student of maritime labor conditions will find in the records of wages received by crews engaged in American shipping, 1872 to the present date, in records of national origins of the men engaged in American shipping, and in lists of mutinies and desertions beginning in 1872, information deserving careful analysis.

## IV

It is not intended in this article to report fully on the archives of the numerous federal agencies in New York City but rather to suggest to the historical investigator possibilities in several fields in which federal archives have generally been left untouched. For the labor historian and the student of immigration, for the historian of military and naval affairs, and for the investigator of American economic and fiscal trends, the federal archives offer virgin opportunities.

The records of the National Reemployment Service and the New York State Employment Bureau, an organization financed in part by the federal government, are of first importance for the student of labor conditions since the beginning of the depression. It may be of interest to note that no published work dealing with the labor injunction appears to have probed much more deeply than the printed reports, although the papers of the Eastern and Southern District courts of New York might lend depth and additional factual bases for such studies. The attention of the labor historian is also called to the records of investigations of health conditions in mines and factories, 1922 to date, in the Division of Industrial Health and Sanitation, United States Public Health Service, and, for more recent sources, to the records of the Public Works Administration at the Sub-Treasury reporting pending and closed cases since 1933, involving investigations and violations of wages and hours agreements by public contractors—a file now confidential.

The student of immigration, particularly of the notable period 1885 to 1910, will find a number of important problems upon which light will be shed by documents at Ellis Island. Material is available for the study of the deportation policy toward aliens, 1905–1919, including the war years, which can be supplemented by correspondence on deportation matters, 1897 to date. The geographical and occupational origins of immigrants and their occupational status in this country can be systematically tabulated from 1897 to the present time. A history of Chinese immigration to this country should include consideration of manifests, 1897 to the present, stating geographical and occupational

origins of Chinese entering through Ellis Island, investigations and reports, 1897 to date, of illegal entries of Chinese, and deportations, 1903–1925, together with arrest books for the years 1903–1928.

Among the historical materials uncovered by the staff of the Survey in the extensive collections of the War and Navy departments in greater New York, are letters and papers of the Sixteenth Regiment dealing with the participation of that unit in the suppression of the Philippine Insurrection, 1899-1902. The letters, which for the most part came from the officers in charge of troops engaged in the pacification of the Kagayan Valley, are far more detailed in character than the original news dispatches found in the *Aparri News* and in the *Army and Navy Journal*.[25] The results of investigations made at the Navy Yard by the staff of the Survey may not settle the controversy as to whether or not the battleship *Maine* was destroyed by external explosion on the evening of February 14, 1898, but the extensive correspondence of the Board of Construction and Repairs and of the Chief Engineer with the Commandant, relating to tests and repairs of this early experiment in modern steel battleship construction, will supplement the findings of the Naval Court of Inquiry, from which source we have drawn our chief knowledge of the subject.[26] An examination of the thousands of packing cases containing obsolete War Department records at the Brooklyn Army Depot has disclosed, among other items of historical interest, records of observations and maps made by American naval officers aboard the Japanese fleet during the Russo-Japanese War. The staff also exhumed from the extensive noncurrent files at the Navy Yard the minutes and correspondence of the aviation inquiry held in the fall of 1918 at London and other European centers, investigating the wartime aviation scandal. The findings, summarized in the American press at the time, reveal defective packing and shipping of aviation cargoes loaded in the United States, interfering

[25] Material of a like nature has been uncovered at Fort Hamilton relating to the Philippine activities of the Eighteenth Regiment, which was similarly engaged in the pacification of native peoples back in the late sixties, as the records of the regiment's part in the Sioux wars indicate.

A colorful, if minor, incident in American Pacific relations was the capture in 1840 of Veindovi, a chief of the Fiji Islands, by the U. S. S. *Peacock* of the Wilkes exploration expedition. The basis for the seizure was the massacre of the crew of the brig, *Charles Doggett*, which had played a role in Pitcairn Island history. The story as related in the files of the Naval Hospital in Brooklyn is of unusual dramatic interest.

[26] A study of the Naval Commandant's files for the three years immediately preceding the catastrophe reveals that the *Maine* was haphazardly constructed, hastily commissioned, with an excessive forward draft, defective ammunition hoists, and unusual pitting and corrosion.

with the complete assemblage of parts abroad and materially hampering the American air force.

Innumerable monographs in the field of American economic and fiscal history will remain unwritten until the federal archives are systematically studied. In the attic of the Assay Office is an extensive collection of records relating to the gold, silver, and platinum policy of that agency, 1876–1934. Of special historical interest is a series of telegrams of October, 1876, shedding further light on the gold purchase policy at that time. In the Melting and Refining Division is an exchange of correspondence relating to the seizures of gold under executive order of April 5, 1933.

Many aspects of the economic cycle still await careful study and analysis—for example, the role of bankruptcy litigation. In this connection the extensive collection in the Southern District Court of New York of bankruptcy cases under the acts of 1800, 1841, 1867, and 1898, remain to be studied. The docket entries under the Bankruptcy Act of 1841 should be examined by any student of the panic of 1837 and its aftermath, as they go to the heart of situations treated in contemporary business journals. We still await the historians of our latest industrial boom and depression. If they were to confine themselves to federal materials in New York City alone, they would have enough for several works of encyclopedic proportion. Among other sources it would be profitable to examine the record of bankruptcy petitions in the district courts, 1924-1934; the archives of the United States attorneys of both districts dealing with prosecutions for violations of the National Banking Act, 1929–1935; and the records of the investigation of the guaranteed mortgage companies of New York, September, 1934 to date, made by the Special Assistant to the Attorney General and in the custody of the Department of Justice in New York City. From judicial sources, the investigator could turn to the income tax returns for the period under examination at the three major internal revenue offices; to the records of railroad financing for these years, among the confidential archives of the Interstate Commerce Commission at the Sub-Treasury; to the extensive data on the status of unemployment compiled by the National Reemployment Service, the New York State Employment Bureau, the Civil Works Administration, the Works Progress Administration, and the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the documents of the New York Loan Agency of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation relating to the examinations of corporations and individuals applying for loans and

detailing the previous financial history of the applicant; and to the records of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Such an investigation will be in reality a monumental task of co-operative research, but since it is sure to be attempted, our interest is to see that it is done thoroughly.

Special aspects of recent American history are richly detailed in the federal archives, perhaps none more fully than the dismal history of the enforcement of the "noble experiment". In both district courts the dockets prior to 1933 are overtaxed with liquor libels, permit actions, etc., and an even more extensive collection of material relating to prohibition enforcement will be found among the archives of the Alcohol Tax Unit, District No. 2, Bureau of Internal Revenue, at the Federal Building.[27] This material should be supplemented by a study of the Coast Guard records in New York City and at subsidiary Long Island stations. Illuminating the history of the American Civil Service is a collection of letters uncovered at the Appraiser's Stores between the Appraiser's office and the Collector, covering the period 1866–1904. These furnish a detailed picture of the working of Civil Service during those years and more especially during the regime of Chester A. Arthur as Collector of the Port of New York. Included are letters from Theodore Roosevelt while serving on the New York Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission in the Federal Building has a file of correspondence for the years 1898 to 1905. An examination of the records of the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Agriculture, at the Appraiser's Stores, reveals a wealth of unused data dealing with the enforcement of the federal food and drug laws.[28] Finally, in the field of public health, attention must be called to the valuable storehouse of information at Quarantine, at Rosebank, Staten Island, including a manuscript history of the station, and to the records of the various federal hospitals—the marine hospitals, the veterans' hospitals, and the Naval

[27] Among the files of this bureau which should reward investigation are: records of closed major cases, 1926-1936; special investigations, 1928-1933; miscellaneous files, 1923 to date; bonded winery permits, 1920 to date; orders revoking physicians' permits to prescribe intoxicating liquor, 1931; cancelled stills, 1922-1936; special bonded warehouses, 1923 to date.

[28] Suggestions for research in this office include: Sherley Amendment, import index and summary, 1918 to date; old Sherley Amendment file, 1920-1928; subject files (interstate commerce), 1918 to date; factory reports, 1919 to date; imports, branch stations, 1929-1933. A study of the files of the Meat Inspection Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Federal Building, reveals an unenviable record of violations by some of the better-known packing houses.

Hospital in Brooklyn, which, among other files of historical interest, possesses a manuscript history of the institution.

V

The Survey of Federal Archives is unique, in its inclusion among the archives which it is examining, of photographic material, motion picture film, and sound recording. For the future social historian these will often have far more significance than the standard sources customarily consulted today. The need for proper attention to this type of material is even greater than in the case of papers, as motion picture film, for example, when not properly cared for, becomes shrunken and brittle, whereupon it is regarded as of no further use and needlessly destroyed. About fifteen thousand feet of motion picture film of navy activities during the World War are stored at the Federal Building and in the Navy Yard vaults. A large collection of positive prints dealing with the history of the Coast Guard and its activities during prohibition days are in the Sub-Treasury. Today modern mapping on a large scale is done almost entirely from vertical photographs taken from airplanes. The volume of photographic material in the federal archives increases appreciably after 1928, a trend which points to greatly enlarged opportunities for the next generation of scholars.

The fact that the noncurrent federal archives in New York City are in many instances improperly stored, without adequate physical safeguards or orderly arrangement, and without convenient facilities for examination and study, should be of concern to American historians. Fires have in the past taken a heavy toll; for example, the fire at Ellis Island in 1897 destroyed the greater portion of the records in the Administration Building. The Survey in New York City uncovered large collections of records stored without plan or order. It was necessary for the staff of the Survey to sift the large bulk of older records at the Eastern and Southern District courts and systématically reclassify and file this material before detailed reports could possibly be made. Criminal records had to be separated from bankruptcy materials, civil from admiralty, equity from common law. The papers had to be untied, vacuumed, and rearranged. This work has now been completed, and it may be safely asserted that the federal court records are today more accessible for the research worker and in better physical condition than are the older papers of other federal agencies in New York City. At other locations, such as the Custom House subbasement and the vault at Ellis

Island, archival conditions are still unsatisfactory. A portion of the important records of the Interstate Commerce Commission, New York Bureau of Accounts, is stored in a lavatory in the Sub-Treasury. At the Army Depot in Brooklyn the bulk of the noncurrent material is in wooden packing cases, about three thousand in all. At Mill Rock Base in the East River the staff found the army engineering records virtually abandoned in several storage rooms completely lacking in ventilation. At other locations records are stored away in attics, as at Fort Jay on Governor's Island, or in basements or cellars, as are records of the United States Shipping Board in the Department of the Interior Building. Among the records found in an attic heap in the Brooklyn Federal Building were papers belonging to the Schechter Case—that recent storm center of constitutional controversy. In the drawer of an old desk which the Post Office authorities kindly lent the Regional Director for the work of the Survey at its Old Post Office Building headquarters, were found, by chance, the testimony and briefs in the Morro Castle Case, apparently abandoned by the United States District Attorney's staff on moving to the new Federal Court House in the winter of 1936.

It would not be reasonable, however, to place the entire onus of criticism for the conditions of the older federal records upon the shoulders of responsible officials of the several bureaus involved. The great increase in federal activity and authority within the last decade, the multiplication of new federal agencies, and the ever-growing business of certain major units, such as the Internal Revenue Bureau, have resulted in magnifying the volume of current records in New York City.[29] The custodians have been without adequate physical facilities for the storage of the older records or even sufficient facilities for many of the newer ones. They have generally been without funds for their proper sifting and classification with a view to determining how much of the noncurrent material was "useless", both to the business of the government and of the historian, and therefore not worth preserving.

For the adequate storage of our federal archives present facilities in New York City are obviously inadequate. A definite program of action should properly be deferred until the completion of the nationwide investigation. It may be stated as the view of the writer, however, based upon a study of the problem in New York City, that a possible solution

[29] According to Dr. R. D. W. Connor, Archivist of the United States, during the thirteen years from 1917 to 1930 the government accumulated more than twice as many records as it had collected for the whole preceding period of 127 years.

is offered by regional archival repositories set up at strategic centers of the country and under the supervision of the National Archives. A repository of archives in New York City or its vicinity would relieve clerks and custodians of the burden of storing noncurrent material not strictly needed for the daily transactions of government bureaus and afford better facilities for examination with a view to permanent preservation, microfilming, or destruction, as the case might warrant—tasks which should only be undertaken under the supervision of scholars trained in archival work. Such a repository would richly enhance the research opportunities of historians using our federal archives in New York City and would immeasurably prolong the life span of the archives as well.

RICHARD B. MORRIS.

*Regional Director, Survey of Federal Archives, New York City and Long Island.*

## DOCUMENTS

### Monroe on the Adams-Clay "Bargain" [1]

The circumstances of the election of 1825 are a familiar story. Of the electoral votes Andrew Jackson received ninety-nine, John Quincy Adams, eighty-four, William H. Crawford, forty-one, and Henry Clay, thirty-seven. Under these conditions it became the duty of the House of Representatives to choose between the three highest candidates; the choice lay in fact between Adams and Jackson; the support of Clay promised to be decisive. Clay was therefore assiduously courted by the "friends" of both Jackson and Adams. Some days before the election—but after Clay's intention of supporting Adams was known—a Jackson partisan publicly charged that a bargain had been struck whereby Clay would support Adams, receiving in return the Secretaryship of State in Adams's cabinet. Clay bitterly denied the charge, but he did support Adams, and he was appointed Secretary of State by Adams. This sequence of events was proof sufficient for Jackson and his followers. Not only had Jackson received more electoral votes and, they claimed, more popular votes than Adams, but he had also the greater popular support in the very states whose votes in the House Clay had controlled. Clay and Adams had thus by "corrupt bargain" secured office for themselves, wronged Jackson, and defeated the will of the people. This charge, whatever its merits, did Adams and Clay sore damage and furnished the battle cry for Jackson's victory in 1828.

The memoranda here presented deal primarily with Monroe's attitude toward the Adams-Clay alliance. When Monroe learned from Adams that Clay would be appointed Secretary of State he saw clearly the danger in the appointment and opposed it. But abundant caution kept him from speaking out. Instead he resorted to nocturnal reflection. This strengthened his conviction of danger and gave rise to the fear that his silence might be regarded as approval. He therefore dis-

[1] The unsigned sheets containing the memoranda printed below (together with other Monroe material of less interest) were taken by a Confederate officer from one of his men during the Civil War. They are now in the possession of Mr. Erwin W. Smith of Houston, Texas, whose kindness makes possible this publication. I am indebted to Dr. J. Franklin Jameson and Dr. Thomas P. Martin, of the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress, for confirmatory identification of the handwriting. Photostatic copies of the original sheets have been deposited in the Library of Congress.

patched an emissary to Adams in a circumspect attempt to block the appointment or at least to make his own views known. But while Monroe had been hesitating, Adams had spoken to Clay, and Monroe's emissary accomplished nothing.[2] The only result of the episode was the record below, intended no doubt to protect Monroe if his position in the matter was ever questioned. Aside from its central incident, the record evidences Monroe's scrupulous neutrality in the election and his desire that his opinions and policies should receive consideration and continuation by his successor.

BARNES F. LATHROP.

*Austin, Texas.*

MEMORANDA OF PRESIDENT MONROE

Feb—
Friday 11. 1825

The election of President took place on wednesday the 9th On the evening of that day, being that of the Drawing room, a large crowd assembl'd, and among them Mr Adams who had been elected, & Genl Jackson one of his competitors. I receiv'd both with equal kindness, without adverting with either, to the late election. I could not congratulate, the one, without indicating a preference for him, to the other, which I did not deem proper, on principle, & in which I was the more confirm'd, having carefully abstaind from all interference in the election. On the next day in the evening, I attended, the military ball, where I met Mr Adams, and in which I avoided with equal care, any allusion to the late election, the meeting being in public, & the attention drawn to us. I receivd him however with the utmost kindness. On friday evening he called on me about 4 o.clock, when I inform'd him, that I had proposed, to the Senate, by nomination, the transfer of Mr Smith from London to Madrid, & of Mr Appliton from Madrid to London, as I had inform'd him that I should do. A particular motive for acting in this affair, was, to relieve Mr Adams from the necessity of doing it himself, Mr Smith being his nephew, and a transfer of him to some other station, being necessary, in consequence of a difference between him & Mr Rush.[3]

I then added, to Mr Adams, that in regard to the late important occurrence, he would enter the administration, with my best wishes for his success, on his own acct, as well as that of our country, & if my opinion should be desir'd by him, either now, or at any time hereafter, on public affairs, that I would give it to him with pleasure. He thank'd me for this expression of good wishes towards him; observ'd, that he was grateful to the State of Virginia, for the attention shewn, & confidence reposed in him, by citizens

[2] It is unlikely—if one may hazard a guess—that Monroe's advice would in any case have altered Adams's intent. He had already been threatened with what was to come but remained steadfast. *Cf.* C. F. Adams, ed., *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams,* VI, 506-507.

[3] John Adams Smith, a grandson of John Adams, was Secretary of Legation at London; John James Appleton was Secretary of Legation at Madrid; and Richard Rush was at this time Minister to England.

from that State, as he owed to them, the opportunities which had been afforded to him, of serving his country, in the important stations he had held. He said, that he wished to conciliate the State towards his adm$^{n}$, & hoped that he should not experience from it, a systematic opposition. I assurd him, that such an opposition need not be apprehended; that the character of the State, afforded a security, that support or opposition, would depend on the course pursued, and on the measures themselves; if sound that they would be approved, & if not opposed, & for no other cause. I intimated, that I thought, that some of the members from the State, pushed certain principles, founded on a construction of the constitution, to too great an extent. In this, I alluded particularly to, their opposition to the right of appropriating the public money, to purposes of internal improvement, and which I thought, had been fully sanctioned, by the Cumberland, & other roads, but particularly by that one, and by my two immediate predecessors: that the construction had originated in a just principle, but was now carried too far.[4] He observd, that he hoped, no question of that kind, would occur, during his adm$^{n}$, being persuaded as I understood him to say, or at least to imply that the construction, which I had given, to the constitution, would meet any occurrence which might be anticipated.

He observ'd that he should be very happy, at all times, to have my opinion, & advice on public measures—that on the subject of his adm$^{n}$, he sho$^{d}$ be glad to receive it, retaining his right to decide for himself—that he had decided to offer or had offerd the dep$^{t}$ of State, to M$^{r}$ Clay, & had expressd a wish to M$^{r}$ Crawford,[5] that he would remain in the Treasury & then read to me, the answer, of M$^{r}$ Crawford to a letter, which he had written to him, to that effect. I concluded from this, that he had already, made, the offer to M$^{r}$ Clay, likewise.[6] I thought myself precluded therefore from giving him any advice, or even my opinion, on the subject, and I did not. In this I was the more confirm'd, from an intimation made by him, that he was desirous of conciliating, by his appointments, the friends of M$^{r}$ Crawford, they having been marked, in their opposition, to the administration. With this view I understood that his attention was drawn to Col: J. Barbour,[7] as successor to M$^{r}$ Crawford—[8]

[4] Monroe believed, of course, that Congress had power to appropriate money for internal improvements but had not the power to construct, maintain, or administer them. *Cf.* his "Views on the Subject of Internal Improvements", transmitted to Congress on May 4, 1822, in James D. Richardson, ed., *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, II, 144-183.

[5] William Harris Crawford, Secretary of the Treasury, 1816-1825.

[6] Adams had not yet made the offer to Clay but did so a few hours later. *Memoirs*, VI, 508.

[7] James Barbour, senator from Virginia, 1815-1825, Secretary of War, 1825-1828.

[8] Adams's version of the main portion of the above conversation with Monroe is as follows:

> . . . I told the President I had invited Mr. Crawford to remain at the head of the Treasury Department, and showed him the letter I had received from him this morning, in very friendly terms declining the offer. I then said that I should offer the Department of State to Mr. Clay, considering it due to his talents and services, to the Western section of the Union, whence he comes, and to the confidence in me manifested by their delegations; that for the Treasury and War Departments I should be glad to take his advice, and to consult him with reference to other objects of public interest, if it would be agreeable to him.
>
> He said he would readily give me his opinions upon any subject I should desire; that

[Feb.] 12. Having reflected much, in the course of the night, on the communication made me by Mr Adams respecting, his admn, & particularly the appointment of Mr Clay to the dept of State, I felt very much disturb'd by it, from a belief that it would produce, a very unfavorable effect, on Mr Adams, & the public, as well as Mr Clay. It was known that the people of Kentucky preferr'd Genl Jackson to Mr Adams, & that a like preference was given to him, by the people of some of the other western States, whose members had voted for Mr Adams. I doubted whether, notwithstanding the impression which he had made on my mind, that he had already taken the step, I ought not, to have communicated to him the objections which occurr'd to me against it, & was particularly anxious that he shod draw no inference from my silence that I approved the measure. To ascertain the fact, I requested an interview at a very early hour, this morning, with [blank] [9] who was, I knew, of the same opinion with me, as to the impropriety of such an appointment, & requested him on an intimation of its danger, to see Mr Adams, if he thought proper, & to make known to him, the public sentiments respecting it. He did so, & found, as he afterwards informd me, that the offer had already been made to Mr Clay.

Feby 14. In the evening Mr Adams called, & adverting to what had pass'd in the former interview, stated that he had recd an answer to the proposition which he had then inform'd me, he had made to Mr Clay, which was that he wod accept the dept. I was much gratified to find, that I had not misunderstood, his first intimation to me, respecting the offer made to Mr Clay.

upon his own election he had consulted his predecessor, Mr. Madison; he had then been very earnestly pressed with regard to the formation of his Administration, and by no one with more importunity than by Jonathan Russell; that he had named to Mr. Madison the persons whom he proposed to nominate, and Mr. Madison had fully approved them. I understood him as wishing that I would pursue the same course." *Memoirs,* VI, 508.

[9] From Adams's record (*Memoirs,* VI, 508-509) of his callers on February 12, 1825, it seems certain that Monroe's emissary was Major General Jacob Jennings Brown (1775-1828), Commander of the United States Army, 1821-1828. Brown apparently did not inform Adams that he spoke for Monroe as well as for himself.

# REVIEWS OF BOOKS

## ANCIENT HISTORY

*La civiltà del mondo antico.* Per Ettore Ciccotti. Due volumi. (Udine: Istituto delle Edizioni Accademiche. 1935. Pp. xxiv, 408; vii, 400. 100 l.)

Not since Eduard Meyer, and not often before him, has anyone attempted to examine the whole structure of ancient society or, more correctly, the current conception of that structure. It is difficult enough to study history within the traditional framework. To take it apart, piece by piece, requires courage, imagination, and a knowledge of detail in the whole field of human experience which few possess. Ciccotti was impelled to and is, indeed, admirably fitted for such a work because his active participation in the complex practical problems of contemporary society combined with his unceasing historical research sensitized him to the varied possibilities and alternatives of historical development. While teaching ancient history and writing voluminously in the field, he was also an active member of the Italian Socialist party and for a time a deputy, but later he opposed it for its neutrality stand during the war. He was a prolific publicist, editor of the standard Italian translations of Marx, Engels, and Lassalle, and, with Pareto, editor of the *Biblioteca di Storia Economica.* In 1922 he was appointed senator and has continued to fight—this time Mussolini. Now, well past his seventieth year and living in an antagonistic environment, he has tapped new sources of strength to produce this "work of synthesis", this series of "problem studies" sweeping over the whole range of ancient society. Departure from the chronological method has not prevented him from presenting a well-integrated analysis of the complex interrelation of forces, material and moral, which is human society at every level. The final result is far from a complete success, but certain phases, notably economic and political problems and the decline of the Roman Empire, are treated brilliantly, and the entire book bristles with the provocative insights that Rostovtzeff alone of living ancient historians can parallel.

The fundamental premise which underlies all of Ciccotti's work is that man is and always has been a social creature. The history of human achievement in every sphere of activity is the history of "co-operation", "association", "class conflict". To understand that history, then, it is necessary to focus attention on society and social relations, not on the individual. "Names in history serve to please the vanity of the person named rather than to instruct the reader." These social relations determine the entire moral and intellectual structure, and the two spheres, the objective and the subjective, interact in highly complicated fashion. The history of man thus becomes the history

of an infinitely complex group of economic, political, religious, legal, moral, artistic, and literary forces, all in constant and related flux. Since the fundamental and earliest function of social organization is the satisfaction of the individual's basic needs, needs which increase along with the development of society itself, it is the forces which are directed squarely at those needs which are "the most demanding and continuous, the most germinal and active". Here lies the solution of the problem of historical periodization. Since all aspects of life are inextricably bound together, only a fundamental transformation in the entire complex ushers in a new period. Though Ciccotti never says so explicitly, he clearly justifies the retention of the traditional unity of the ancient world by the unbroken existence of just such a complex. At the root lie slavery and the productive relations, agricultural and industrial. Upon those foundations society could and did develop in different ways, but only the change to a feudal system of relations brought a distinctly new period. It is always within a given society that the causes of its development or decline are to be found. This point Ciccotti has occasion to emphasize and demonstrate time and again.

The sequence of chapters follows logically from Ciccotti's position. After a short, negligible section on prehistory, he discusses in turn, as topics which severally cover the entire span of ancient development, economics, politics, demography, religion, law, ethics, culture (literature, art, and science), and finally, the decline of Rome. Each part is complete in itself and at the same time gains immeasurably from its position within the book as a whole and from the materials assembled in the other chapters. One comes away from the book with a well-rounded view of the unity of ancient society, of the role of the various elements in that society, and of the history of the separate institutions and problems. The treatment of economics, religion, etc., is of course limited to drawing the outlines and filling in only the bare essentials. Ciccotti's range of knowledge is extraordinary, and his scholarship is excellent, although he is not always acquainted with the latest researches.

It has already been indicated that the actual achievement is very uneven. At its best, the book ranks with the outstanding historical works of modern times. I know of no discussion of ancient economy that is comparable to Ciccotti's eighty-two pages. His training in economics enables him to correct just those misconceptions which have vitiated so much of the writing on this subject, Eduard Meyer's, for example. By his analysis of the origins of individual ownership of property, division of labor and commerce, by his firm grasp of the nature of slavery, by his discussion of the precise character of ancient "capitalism", by his understanding of the role of violence, Ciccotti has at last prepared the ground for a real economic history of antiquity. With equal success the chapter on politics attacks the fundamental problems: the growth of the state and its various forms, the nature and basis of control, the organization of conquered territory, etc. Here, and again in greater detail

in the concluding chapter, the decline of the Roman Empire is correctly treated in dynamic terms. Ciccotti avoids the mistake of accepting taxation, bureaucracy, decline of the middle class, and other obvious symptoms as causes. His own conception is developed in terms of the very structure of Roman society and hence of the empire, but it is too complicated to be analyzed here. The description of the actual process, its manifestations and the contemporary reactions, reaches heights of lyricism. Throughout the book there runs the feeling for movement and integration which gives the material its vitality and its significance.

But Ciccotti fails by his own standards when he writes the history of ideas. The chapters on religion, ethics, culture, and, strangely enough, law are written too much after the fashion of school texts. The contrast between the treatment of certain points in these chapters and the analysis of the same problems elsewhere in the book is often startling. It is impossible to understand how he could discuss Hammurabi's code without reference to the reappearance of small property or the "moral problem" without treating slavery. There is a steady but meaningless reiteration of the point that all these ideological aspects of society have their roots in the objective conditions of existence, meaningless because Ciccotti rarely describes those conditions or analyzes the connection. Alone, these particular chapters do not merit much attention, but within the entire work their value is greatly enhanced. The thoughtful reader will find much in them that is new and provocative in terms of the concepts and materials to be found in the more successful portions.

Above all, Ciccotti has retained his dispassionate interest in historical truth (there is no moralizing in the book except for some minor lapses), his courage in defense of that truth as he conceives it (the authoritarian state will derive little satisfaction from the book), and his unbounded faith in man and civilization. It was from these motives that the book was written. The three chapters already singled out would, if translated, be that rare phenomenon, a book which both specialists and laymen would find interesting and indispensable.

*The College of the City of New York.* MOSES I. FINKELSTEIN.

*An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome.* Edited by Tenney Frank *et al.* Volume II, *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian.* By ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1936. Pp. x, 732. $4.00.)

THE primary purpose of the work of which this volume forms the second part (the first part was reviewed in this journal, XXXIX, 711) is to present the sources for the economic life of the Roman Empire. For the economic history of Egypt we have an embarrassing wealth of papyrological material, consisting of contemporary business documents, both private and public. Literary references are few and to a large degree so casual and unsatisfactory

as seriously to impair their usefulness. Consequently, Johnson prints only a few selections from ancient authors, though references are made to them in the commentary.

The abundance of evidence from papyri has both facilitated and made more difficult the editor's task, for although it was a simple matter to find illustrative material, the work of selection was not easy. Johnson has partially solved the problem in two ways. He has conserved space by printing only translations. The reader must consult papyrological publications if he is interested in the original Greek texts. Secondly, Johnson has summarized the contents of several hundred documents for which he was unable to find room. The book contains translations of about four hundred texts from papyri, about fifteen inscriptions, and a few extracts from other sources.

Paradoxical as it may seem, despite the detailed information furnished by the thousands of papyri which have come out of Egypt in the last half century, the resultant pictures of Egyptian life are still episodic and impressionistic. Though the papyri show us the Egyptian people engaged in their daily tasks, and though we know many facts, including the prices paid for land and its produce, it is hard to generalize about the country, for details are often contradictory, and the conditions of tenure and productivity varied. Even when prices are definitely known, no comparisons with other parts of the Roman Empire are possible, for there is as yet no agreement about the size of Egyptian measures, and the exchange value of Egyptian currency is highly conjectural. There were at least ten different varieties of the artaba, a measure used for grain in Egypt, many of them existing concurrently in the same locality. Confusion and uncertainty are therefore inevitable, especially as Segre's table of equivalents, reprinted by Johnson (p. 466) has not been generally accepted. Even Johnson, though he nowhere makes this clear to the reader, apparently disagrees with Segre, for he gives in his commentary equivalents for the artaba in terms of Roman modii and English pounds which I have been unable to reconcile with the table he has printed. In passing, it should be noted that the table contains three misprints (see No. 64, p. 129).

The difficulty of presenting papyri in translation is illustrated by No. 64. In it a Greek word, the meaning of which is uncertain, is represented by a dash, as though there were a lacuna at that point. It is true that the word is referred to in the introductory lemma, but without any hint as to its meaning or place in the papyrus. The oversight was probably due to the fact that Johnson had reprinted without change translations which accompanied the original publications edited by British and American scholars. He did not always realize that the translations were not fully intelligible without the Greek text and the editor's notes.

The book is divided into five chapters. The first deals with the land, under the following topics: agricultural products, the Nile and irrigation, classification of land, survey and inspection, leases, sales and mortgages, farm

accounts, livestock, and mineral resources. Chapter II is concerned with the people: population and census, houses and miscellaneous property, slavery, nursing contracts, education, marriage and divorce, amusements, wages and living costs, and rural expense. The chapter on industry and commerce contains information about monopolies, apprenticeship, guilds, transportation, Egyptian currency, banking, loans and deposits, loans and distribution of seed, and weights and measures. The chapter on taxation begins with a discussion of the revenues that accrued to Rome from Egypt, but most of it is devoted to the great variety of taxes and other charges collected from the people: revenues from arable lands, taxes on garden lands, poll tax, taxes on trades, assessments, customs, liturgies, and requisitions. There is an alphabetic list of miscellaneous taxes and fees covering nearly thirty pages and including about two hundred and fifty items. The last chapter includes sections on public works, temple accounts, military accounts, municipal accounts, and unclassified laws and edicts.

The selected bibliography of ten pages provides a concrete illustration of the book's usefulness, for it shows how widely scattered are the sources for Egyptian economic history and how difficult is the task of keeping in touch with the progress of scholarship in this field even when one has access to a well-equipped papyrological library.

Professor Johnson is to be commended upon the success with which he has completed a laborious undertaking. The book is a worthy companion of Professor Frank's volume on Republican Italy, though the nature of the sources will probably lessen its appeal to the general reader.

ALLEN B. WEST.

*Yale Classical Studies.* Edited for the Department of Classics by AUSTIN M. HARMON, Lampson Professor of Greek. Volume V. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1935. Pp. 304. $3.00.)

THIS volume contains four articles, each of which is of interest to students of ancient history. In the "Dramatic Construction of Tacitus' Annals" (pp. 1-53) C. W. Mendell reaches the conclusion that in the dramatic character of the Roman historian's technique we find the basis for his selection of his material in accordance with his admitted bias against the principate. The writer, however, vigorously defends Tacitus against the charge of manufacturing episodes to suit his purpose, showing that the anti-Caesarian tradition was well established before the composition of the *Annals*.

"The Literary Tradition Concerning Hermias of Atarneus" (pp. 57-92) by D. E. W. Wormell traces the rise and persistence of the friendly and hostile traditions regarding this interesting philosopher-tyrant of the fourth century B.C. The article starts from the Didymus commentary to Demosthenes and reaches some valuable conclusions regarding the general characteristics of Hellenistic historical writing.

A. R. Bellinger and C. B. Welles publish (pp. 93-154) with exhaustive

commentaries a "Third Century Contract of Sale from Edessa in Osrhoene", found written in Syriac on a parchment in the excavations of Yale University and the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres at Dura-Europos. The text, given in the translation of Professor C. C. Torrey, records the sale of a slave girl and is dated at Edessa in May, 243 A.D. It is significant that this Syriac deed, although showing traces of local, Mesopotamian, and Roman influences, is essentially Greek in character and exemplifies a phase of the Hellenistic legal practice established throughout the Near East and so well known through papyrus documents from Egypt. From information supplied by this new text the editors are able to make important contributions to our knowledge of the constitution of Edessa and its chronology.

Of the greatest interest and importance is the long and copiously illustrated contribution of M. I. Rostovtzeff, "Dura and the Problem of Parthian Art" (pp. 155-304). The author challenges the generally accepted view that Parthian art was but "a barbarized and degenerate version of the Graeco-Mesopotamian art of the Hellenistic period", and gives a brief survey of art in the Parthian satrapies and countries subject to Iranian influence outside the Parthian empire, emphasizing the necessity of studying local artistic developments. He then undertakes a detailed analysis of the architecture, sculpture, drawing, painting, and the minor arts at Dura, showing their affinities with similar finds in Syria, Mesopotamia, Iran, India, Central Asia, China, and South Russia. He determines their special characteristics and so lays the foundations for his general conclusion that Parthian art is a revival of traditional Oriental subjects treated "in the traditional Iranian style . . . a style almost completely free of Greek elements".

*University of Michigan.* A. E. R. Boak.

*Epochen der römischen Geschichte.* Von Franz Altheim. Band II, *Weltherrschaft und Krise.* [Frankfurter Studien zur Religion und Kultur der Antike.] (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann. 1935. Pp. 333. 10 M.)

In a brief review it is impossible to do more than to indicate the character of this stimulating and provocative volume. It is not easy reading but repays the time spent on it, whether its views are accepted or not. With an outlook broad enough to include pictures of Roman, Carthaginian, Hellenistic, Parthian, and west Mediterranean cultures, it presents not a history but an interpretation of the history of the period of the Punic and eastern wars and the succeeding period of crises and changes. The author takes for granted a general knowledge of the material and of modern theories and enters into details only when he has something new to add that helps him in the development of his own interpretation. The points considered in some detail include the outbreak and causes of the Second Punic War, the identity of an Italic tribe mentioned by Callimachus, the origin of satire, the *Atalanta* of

Pacuvius, the origin of triumphal *fasti*, and early Roman historiography. The bibliography is reasonably full, though some important works are overlooked. There is a brief but useful index.

The central point of the study is a justification of Polybius's choice of 168 as an epochal year. In the period before this year Rome broke the power of the larger civilized states; in the succeeding period she herself had to deal with barbarians formerly kept in check by these states. By this time, too, large fortunes had been created, and the rich had acquired control of the land. Also in connection with other phases of the culture the author again and again notices a change at or near this date. In his general point of view the author combines determinism with a decided interest in great personalities. The character and work of some men, for instance Hannibal and Scipio, he believes can be judged better by the legends that sprang up concerning them than by a detailed study of their careers. He is little troubled by the problem of imperialism but largely takes an imperialistic tendency for granted. Personally, I am inclined to agree with the remark that indirect control is control, after all, and is to be distinguished from direct control only in its method and not in its purpose. The fact that the past often determines the course of future action is noted in connection with the struggle between Rome and Carthage but is forgotten in connection with the strong condemnations of the policies of Hellenistic rulers. It seems to have been as impossible for Hellenistic as for modern statesmen to subordinate their old rivalries and ambitions to the larger issues of the present.

*The University of Chicago.* JAKOB A. O. LARSEN.

*Roman Alpine Routes.* By WALTER WOODBURN HYDE. [American Philosophical Society.] (Philadelphia: the Society. 1935. Pp. xvi, 248. $3.00.)

THE impression derived from Van Loon's illustration entitled "Rome", that of a body of infantry marching across a bridge, is one of a state successful because of its conquest of men and of nature. The task to which Dr. Hyde addresses himself is a restatement of the facts of one great victory of Rome over nature, namely the subjugation of the Alpine barrier to advance. The monograph is a task well done, then decorated and completed by the inclusion of some unusual features. Among them are the author's manifest enjoyment in his work, discussion of topics only distantly related to his main theme, and many details of pre-Roman and post-Roman use of each important pass.

A selected bibliography, supplemented by copious additions in the footnotes, is followed by a general and at times discursive introductory account. Like Augustus, Dr. Hyde hastens slowly. He finds time for digressions which carry him to the sources of the tin and amber supply, to the conquest of Cisalpine Gaul by Rome, to Roman "lack of appreciation of the romantic side of mountain scenery", and, in a footnote, to the proposed tunnels of the

Los Angeles metropolitan water project. A description and history of each and every important Alpine pass form the body of the book. There is appended the inevitable excursus on Hannibal's route. The author holds no brief for any one pass. He seeks merely to eliminate the impossible and improbable conjectures. His conclusion, based on observation and on the reading of an imposing array of commentaries, is that "much more can be said in favor of" the Little St. Bernard route than of "any other in the Western Alps".

The continuity of use of Alpine passes is reiterated. That Roman use was relatively limited is argued from the fact that the Romans knew but seventeen of the twenty-three major passes and but nineteen of the approximately five hundred minor passes. Changes in the motive for use by the Romans is also noted. The original economic motive gave way before the urge for military highways. Under Augustus, the greatest of Roman road builders, the use of the passes by bearers of culture was encouraged, the major use, declares the author, for the next fifteen hundred years. It is a pleasant, if not a scientifically accurate thought on which to close.

*The University of California.* J. J. Van Nostrand.

*The Iudicium Quinquevirale.* By Charles Henry Coster. [Monographs of the Mediaeval Academy of America.] (Cambridge: the Academy. 1935. Pp. vii, 87. $2.25.)

This monograph investigates the judicial committee of five senators first appointed, according to our existing records, by Gratian in A.D. 376 to assist the city prefect of Rome in trying senators arraigned on a capital charge. Mr. Coster seems satisfied that this tribunal had no roots in the past. To explain its establishment by Gratian, he discusses at length the hostile relations between Valentinian I and the senate and sees in the appointment of the *iudicium* a concession made to the Roman aristocracy by the new emperor. Since the efforts of senators to ensure for themselves some safeguard against a despotic ruler go back to Antonine, if not to Flavian times, one regrets that Mr. Coster did not consider the question of whether any such tribunal may have existed before its first mention in our surviving documents (*Cod. Theod.* IX, 1, 13). The author then seeks to define the functions of the committee, though he nowhere makes clear that the city prefect was not obliged to take the committee into partnership, as the use of *licebit* in the edict shows, but could use his discretion in the matter. In the second part of the book the trials of Arvandus, of Basilius and Praetextatus, and finally of Boethius are passed under review. While it is not certain that the *iudicium* functioned in any of these trials, Mr. Coster succeeds in establishing a strong presumption that such was the case in the first and second. To his contention that Boethius also came before the five, most readers, on going over the evidence, will probably exclaim *non liquet*.

It is clear that Mr. Coster has spent much time and thought on his essay, whose argument he supports by more than two hundred notes. Unhappily the book is marred by grave errors. It is very unfortunate that on the first page he makes three serious mistakes in translating *Cod. Theod.* IX, 1, 13: "Provincial governor" is too narrow for *provincialis iudex*, the words *senatorum* to *virorum* depend on *capite*, not on *iudicium*, and *honore functis*, as every student of Roman inscriptions should know, means no more than "who have held office". Again, it is a blunder to interpret (p. 29 with note 122) *supplicatio*, as used by Symmachus, as a religious ceremony. Such was its meaning in republican and early imperial Rome, but in the legal parlance of the later empire it signified a "petition to the Emperor by a private person" (W. W. Buckland, *Textbook of Roman Law*, p. 666, where the procedure and the reason for its adoption are fully explained). Mr. Coster does not seem familiar with H. Usener's *Anecdoton Holderi;* for in arguing (note 197) that Boethius's disgrace and death occurred respectively in 525 and 526, he ignores one bit of evidence, long since cited by Usener (pp. 77-78), in support of the generally accepted dates, 523 and 524; namely, the fact that Boethius's chief accuser was rewarded for his services by being made count of the sacred largesses for 524-525. The story in Aimoin (note 213) is derived from a *Life* of Theodoric (see *M. G. H., SS. Aev. Merov.*, II, 214 and Krusch's remarks, *ibid.*, pp. 200 ff.). Finally one wonders whether Young's theory (note 214) was worth a mention at all, let alone nearly a page of discussion.

Mr. Coster's book, as we have said, contains much solid material and is the fruit of hard work. It is all the more regrettable that, before publication, he did not submit it to an expert, preferably in Roman Law.

*Cornell University.* M. L. W. Laistner.

## MEDIEVAL HISTORY

*Histoire du Moyen Age.* Tome III, *Le monde oriental de 395 à 1081.* Par Charles Diehl, membre de l'Institut, et Georges Marçais, correspondant de l'Institut. [Histoire générale, publiée sous la direction de Gustave Glotz.] (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 1936. Pp. xxiii, 627. 60 fr.)

This book forms one section of a series intended to cover the Middle Ages in Europe and Asia in ten volumes. It contains the history of the Byzantine Empire and that of the Islamic states; approximately an equal number of pages is devoted to each subject. One inevitably starts to compare it with the kindred work of Gaudefroy-Demombynes and Platonov in the series edited by E. Cavaignac (see *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVII, 584). Diehl's chapters on Byzantine history are much more detailed than Platonov's cursory sketch. They are written with his customary felicity and elegance

but contain nothing that is not to be found in his earlier works. Sources are given for the main statements, however, and secondary literature is cited to some extent, though erratically; there are surprising gaps where mention of certain basic books might justly be expected. The proofreading of these chapters likewise leaves much to be desired: the Greek lemmas in the text contain not a few errors and false accents, and in some instances words are positively corrupt (p. 149, Schaliin = Shahin; p. 498, proto a secretia = protoasecretis; p. 526, acestsecotis = aristocratie!). The general bibliography on Byzantium (pp. ix-xvii) is distinctly sketchy.

The treatment of Moslem history by Marçais is much more satisfactory and, in the reviewer's estimation, distinctly superior to Gaudefroy-Demombynes's account. In addition to the political history Marçais gives a detailed account of the rise and the political role of the various Moslem heretical sects, which results in a clear picture of how religion and politics interacted in various milieus. The rise and development of Arabic literature and science is well illustrated and attractively formulated. Particularly useful is the account of the organization of the Abbasid state and the rise of the smaller principalities from the wreck of the caliphate. The history of these states is treated as a connected series of phenomena and integrated into an understandable whole. Pre-eminently good is the account of Islam in Africa, in which field the author is a specialist. Less well handled is the penetration of the Turkish element. It is surprising that neither of W. Barthold's standard works, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion* and *12 Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türken Mittelasiens*, is cited, either in the bibliography (otherwise well chosen and comprehensive) or in the notes. One could also wish that the account of the border wars between Byzantium and the Arabs had been gathered together and systematized in one place instead of being divided between Moslem and Christian history. Some repetition could thus have been avoided. No Arabic letters are used, and hence it would have been helpful for those whose knowledge of that idiom is not profound if the emphatic consonants had been indicated (ṭ ḍ ṣ ẓ, etc.) when exact transcriptions are adduced. From the typographical point of view the volume is cheaply produced. The paper is thin and of poor quality, the face of the font small, and (more serious) the ink is bad, so that the pages smear easily. The use of the book is facilitated by a good index of names, places, and with some systematic lemmas as well. Taking it all together, the book forms a substantial and valuable contribution to the history of the medieval Orient, affording in clear and convenient form a connected account of its historical development.

*Harvard University.* ROBERT P. BLAKE.

*Codices Latini Antiquiores: a Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts prior to the Ninth Century.* Edited by E. A. LOWE. Part II, *Great Britain and Ireland*. [Edited under the auspices of the Union académique inter-

nationale for the American Council of Learned Societies and the Carnegie Institution of Washington.] (New York: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. xvii, 53. $20.00.)

PART II of Lowe's great undertaking is of more interest to palaeographers and theologians than to historians and Latinists. The plates, however, will be illuminating to any who are not familiar with the achievements of the Irish and Anglo-Saxons in calligraphy and art. It is unfortunate that the reproductions are limited by the plan of the work to portions of pages, for the beauty of the more splendid specimens can be realized only when the page—an artistic unit—is presented in its entirety.

The most striking feature of this collection is its lack of classical texts. Not a single complete classical manuscript is listed, unless one counts the Cosmography of Aethicus (242) from the German monastery of Murbach. The great Roman writers appear only in meager scraps from Egypt. Vergil is represented by two fragments of papyrus books (134, 227, the latter text accompanied by a Greek version); Sallust by two fragments (223, 246) of the Jugurthine War and the Conspiracy of Catiline; Cicero by three fragments (210, 224, 226) containing various orations, one (224, *In Catilinam*) with a Greek version, another (226, *In Caecilium*) with a Greek version and Greek scholia; Livy by parts of eight columns of a roll (208) containing an epitome of the fourth, fifth, and sixth decades, and by a scrap of the text of Book I (247); Lucan by a single small strip of parchment (175)—the sole parchment specimen in the group.

Other works are: (1) historical, a Greco-Latin chronicle (225, papyrus), a parchment fragment, *De bellis Macedonicis*, from Egypt (207), and the well-known *ter scriptus* of Granius Licinianus (167); (2) grammatical, a papyrus fragment of "Palaemon" (212) and twelve folios of an unidentified text written over that of Licinianus (166); (3) legal, four fragments from Egypt, two papyrus (120, 249) and two parchment (211, 248). These furnish all the plates which would interest the historian unless he were concerned with the church chroniclers, *e.g.*, Jerome (233a), Orosius (171), Isidore Pacensis (195), Marcellinus (233b), and Bede (139, 191). There are four glossaries: an Egyptian parchment fragment of a Latin-Greek lexicon to the *Aeneid* (137), the famous Corpus glossary (122), the Greco-Latin Glossarium Ps.-Cyrilli (203), and a Latin-Teutonic glossary (243), the last two from some German center. A single medical codex is listed (156), containing Hippocrates, Galen, etc., though medical recipes are found in 203, mentioned above; both of these manuscripts came from the Continent. The great majority of the texts (about five sixths) are theological; half of these are biblical, the rest liturgical and patristic. Five fragments could not be identified.

The distribution by scripts is equally uneven. There are eight fragments written in rustic capitals, all from Egypt. About half of the seventeen early

uncials (sixth century or older) are fragments from Egypt; nearly half of the total number are Continental; ten or eleven are English, all theological, a most interesting group. With one exception, the Commentary of Primasius on the Apocalypse (237), probably written in England, all of the eleven half-uncial manuscripts are fragmentary, nine of them papyri. There are more than thirty representatives of various types of French, Italian, and German minuscule.

Overshadowing all of these is the extraordinary display of manuscripts (sixty-eight) written in the Irish and Anglo-Saxon scripts. Lowe discusses in the introduction the peculiarities of both and the technique of the scribes (prickings, ruling of quires, gatherings, punctuation, abbreviations, spelling, etc.). Here the inference drawn from the method of pricking seems to me questionable; the statements regarding ruling do not always agree with my own observations. On the latter point I miss a reference to Rand's important article "How Many Leaves at a Time?" (*Palaeographia Latina,* V [1927] 52-78).

Lowe rightly stresses the importance of abbreviations, but his reports on individual manuscripts are not uniformly complete or consistent: *e.g.,* there are omitted from 267, abbreviations for the following: habet, huius, nomen, nomine, tamen, tantum, tunc (nunc is given), and unde. The general differentiation, "Insular" (and ancient Notae) and "ordinary" or "common", is not kept: *cf.* the treatment of Insular symbols for dicere and nomen; those for dicit, dixit, dicens in 275 are listed under "Ancient Notae and typically Insular forms", but in 276 they are cited not among "Ancient Notae and many Insular forms" but among "the more ordinary forms" (so also in 267); that for dicunt in 275 is classed as Insular but not so in 272; the abbreviation for nomen in 157 is not included among the "typically Insular" but among "other forms", whereas those for nomine in 276 and nomina in 275 are listed among "Ancient Notae and Insular forms"; the Insular symbol for quia in 152 and 183 is incorrectly included in the non-Insular list.

Lowe's volume is a monument of industry and of painstaking investigation. It is a storehouse of information, rich in stimulating suggestions. It is indispensable to all workers in the field of palaeography.

*The University of Chicago.* CHARLES H. BEESON.

*Das Papsttum: Idee und Wirklichkeit.* Von JOHANNES HALLER. Band I, *Die Grundlagen.* (Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta. 1934. Pp. xiv, 511.)

A question inevitably asked about this second history of the papacy to come out of Germany within five years is how it differs from its predecessor, Caspar's *Geschichte des Papsttums* (reviewed in *Am. Hist. Rev.,* XXXVI, 364 and XL, 104). To begin with, scope and scale are different. Haller proposes to tell the entire story down to the present. His first volume comes as far as Charlemagne's confirmation of the Papal States. Caspar confined

himself to the rise of the papacy to Innocent III, and his two volumes together reach only to the accession of Pepin. Caspar's scale gave room for details of characterization and reasoning and rich quotation of sources. Haller's book keeps to the broader lines. His bibliographies are briefer, though still excellent.

The difference, however, is not merely one of size but of viewpoint. Both men open by announcing their intention of writing the history of an idea realizing itself through the centuries. But Haller immediately makes the point that earlier historians, both Protestant and Catholic, have seen the idea as one and the same from the beginning, whereas he sees it as a union of two separate ideas, not achieved until the eighth century and then forced upon Rome by the ardor of the West. The early Roman bishop claimed, for the most part ineffectually, the Petrine power to bind and loose, but to him and his contemporaries that meant solely the power of the chief apostle to supervise administration and judge disputes over doctrine between other bishops. In time, the state perceived in him a valuable organ of ecclesiastical government, erected the patriarchate of the West, and compelled reluctant provinces to obedience. Eventually, however, doctrinal controversy drew down on the popes the displeasure of Byzantium, and within the empire they became practically impotent. But meanwhile missionaries of English blood were teaching the rising Germanic kingdoms to regard the popes as something more than legal instruments for the government of bishops. To the new Western church they were agents of salvation, doorkeepers of Heaven, spiritual lords of the earth. As an article of religious faith the papacy was a Germanic contribution to the Middle Ages.

One may suggest that historians like Caspar, who treat the papal idea as one, also treat it as a growth and development, finding signs of mounting religious feeling from the fifth century onward. The fact that large sections of the church did not recognize the more exalted conception is no proof that it did not exist. Nor was German devotion as complete a contrast to Byzantine caesaropapism as Haller occasionally implies. His dichotomy seems to cut too sharp a division between periods and racial attitudes. But as a fresh and rapid survey of these seven obscure centuries, his volume deserves all the attention it is apparently receiving.

*Wells College.* L. R. Loomis.

*The Dissolution of the Carolingian Fisc in the Ninth Century.* By James Westfall Thompson, Sidney Hellman Ehrman Professor of European History in the University of California. [University of California Publications in History.] (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1935. Pp. xi, 186.)

Under Professor Thompson's supervision Mrs. Helen Robbins Bittermann, his research assistant for this study, has compiled eight appendixes (pp. 63-

177), six of which list, with their medieval and, when possible, their present names, the manors, monasteries, bishoprics, forests, fisheries, and regions making up the whole or specific parts of the Merovingian, Austrasian, and Carolingian fiscs. Appendix VI contains a summary of alienations of the fisc made by the Carolingians, and VIII, a statistical summary of results. The material for the lists is gathered from the sources indicated on page viii, chief of which is the *Regesta Imperii: Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs unter den Karolingern, 751-918* (2d ed., 1908) by J. F. Böhmer and E. Mühlbacher. For each name in the lists a source reference is given. When in the *Regesta* manors were the object of royal generosity or were located on the royal itineraries, they were considered parts of the fisc. From these lists Mrs. Bittermann has had drawn corresponding maps.

In his preface Professor Thompson interprets in general terms some of the data contained on the maps. In his first two chapters an interpretation of the material concerning the Merovingian and Carolingian fiscs, still in general terms, is combined with other related historical material. In the remaining three chapters (pp. 19-63) Professor Thompson, without particular reference to lists or maps, enters into a detailed discussion of the partitions of the Carolingian Empire culminating in the treaties of Verdun and Meersen. Herein he emphasizes the thesis which he has stated elsewhere, that the treaties were essentially partitions of the crown lands, and that the destruction of the empire consisted primarily in the division of the compact group of crown lands lying between the Seine and the Rhine that formed the economic foundation of the empire. Pages 179 to 186 contain an alphabetical list of works used.

It would be readily admitted that the best approach to an understanding of the politics of the ninth century is through the landed resources of the crown. Hence the material in the monograph is fundamental. The great diligence with which the appendixes are compiled can only be rewarded by the thanks of those scholars who find them useful. The graphic representation of this material in a series of fine maps does just what in general terms Professor Thompson says it does. Nor will one find it difficult to accept his thesis that the disputes and wars of the ninth century were over what has always been considered worth fighting for.

The authors, however, would be the last to insist that this is a definitive study. If nothing else, paucity of documentary information precludes any such result. Many tantalizing questions plead, at least with the reviewer, for a more definite answer than the study attempts. He would, moreover, have wished to see more use made of the Norse invasions to explain the increasing poverty of both eastern and western Carolingians, and to have the account carried down logically to the accession of the Capetians. This may be to expect too much, and it is not meant to detract from the great value of the material contained in the monograph.

Is it Strassburg or Strasbourg? *Constantia* (p. 42) should, I take it, be *consistentia,* and give (p. 50) gives. I am by no means sure that Coulanges's French (p. 46) means what Professor Thompson interprets it to mean, and certainly he would not wish to retain *initiated* (p. 27).

*The University of Nebraska.* EDGAR N. JOHNSON.

*Nikolaus I. und Pseudoisidor.* Von JOHANNES HALLER. (Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta. 1936. Pp. 203. 5 M.)

THIS is an important and engaging study of the character, work, and achievements of a pope who has long held high place in the hierarchy of distinguished medieval churchmen. Professor Haller's essay is written with conviction and distinction, reflecting throughout the learning and scholarship expected from the author of *Das Papsttum.* It is his contention that Pope Nicholas I has fared too well at the hands of historians, who have, almost without exception, followed a pattern set years ago by Baronius. In this way Nicholas has acquired a reputation for originality and boldness that he does not deserve.

Haller's main contention is that Nicholas represented the end, not the beginnings of an epoch in papal history. Though his actions and policies frequently reflect the abilities of a true statesman, Nicholas was actually often more lucky than wise. The fundamental test in evaluating his work is to measure his success. In a pithy sentence Haller states categorically that this pontificate was "eine ergebnislose Episode". The pope had interferred in the affairs of Lothair II, but the king was never brought to judgment, and within two years after Nicholas's death Waldrada had been absolved, and the next pope, Hadrian II, with his own hands had given Lothair the host. In the East, papal ambitions had failed almost completely. The hopes inspired by the change in policy at the accession of Basil I to the throne at Constantinople were of short duration; the church of the East drew further and further away from Rome; and of even greater importance, papal aspirations to control the Bulgarians were lost when these sturdy souls fell under the ecclesiastical control of the Byzantine church.

Haller is especially opposed to the attempts that have been made to prove that the rule of Nicholas was epoch-making, taking issue with writers like Duchesne, Lapôtre, and Von Schubert, and even more directly with Hauck in the latter's *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands.* Furthermore he refuses to see in Nicholas the embodiment of papal claims and a challenge to the state. If there was something new in the coarse, hard, often offensive words the pope addressed at times to lay monarchs, it is important to note that these were but words—words not supported by actions. Opposition arose within his own house, and the real contests were between pope and archbishops, not pope and kings.

It is in the last two of ten chapters that Haller brings the threads of his

story together in an important and clear discussion of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. Once discovered by the pope, it was the sword of the Pseudo-Isidor that he used in his battle with a recalcitrant clergy. But even here, asks Haller, can Nicholas show a real success? Papal history of the late ninth and early tenth centuries is obvious proof that even a fiction could not enhance his fame. Haller dismisses the assertion of Fournier and Le Bras that the decretals had their origin in Le Mans, and he will not even consider Brittany as fertile soil for the forgery but goes directly to the circle which surrounded the deposed Archbishop Ebo, therefore to Hildesheim and Reims. The decretals were, in his opinion, the work of one hand, not that of many. Though there is no bibliography, this volume is well documented, and the evidence upon which the author bases his arguments is often given in full. There is an index of names and places.

*Princeton University.* GRAY C. BOYCE.

*The Chronicle of the Slavs, by Helmold, Priest of Bosau.* Translated with Introduction and Notes by FRANCIS JOSEPH TSCHAN, Professor of European History, The Pennsylvania State College. [Records of Civilization, Austin P. Evans, General Editor.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1935. Pp. xii, 321. $4.00.)

PROFESSOR Tschan dedicates this translation to James Westfall Thompson in token, I take it, of his discipleship and in acknowledgment of the importance of *Feudal Germany,* of which much use is made in the documentation. The translation is made from Schmeidler's edition of 1909. It is preceded by an introduction that acquaints the reader with the chronicler and the previous history of the Saxon frontier. To the reviewer it is regrettable that, even at the sacrifice of some of the present introduction and at the risk of repeating what he has said elsewhere, Professor Tschan did not see fit to analyze the rich contents of his translation and of his own learning in order to give us a more complete statement of the advance of the frontier in the twelfth century and of the part played in this advance by those pioneer colonizers and missionaries, Henry the Lion, the Adolphs of Holstein, Albert the Bear, and Bishops Vicelin, Gerold, and Conrad. But perhaps Professor Tschan, when he has completed his translation of Adam's *Gesta,* plans to write for us a book on the German northeastern frontier.

The translation is made with extreme care and fidelity to the text and is not overburdened with extraneous learning in the footnotes. It makes for smooth and even exciting reading, and in only one or two places would the reviewer perhaps change a word, modify the punctuation, or avoid the inversion of subject and predicate. The straightforwardness of the original Latin has been preserved. Gratitude is due to the translator for the hard work which has given us so excellent a version of an important chronicler and to the editors for including it in this series. One who reads through the

chronicle may fret over what Helmold has omitted in order to include what he wished to include, but he cannot fail to be moved by this candid statement of the relentless march eastward of the German people and the German church, led by bishops of "mad rashness" who were free with the whip and nobles to whom the tithes, tribute, and land of the Slavs were irresistible bait. It is in a sense the old, old story: "Now, however, because God gave plentiful aid and victory to our duke and to the other princes, the Slavs have been everywhere crushed and driven out. A people strong and without number have come from the bounds of the ocean, and taken possession of the territories of the Slavs. They have built cities and churches and have grown in riches beyond all estimation" (pp. 235–236).

*The University of Nebraska.* EDGAR N. JOHNSON.

*Un grand commerce d'exportation au Moyen Age: La draperie des Pays-Bas en France et dans les pays méditerranéens, XII^e-XV^e siècle.* Par HENRI LAURENT, chargé de cours à l'Université de Bruxelles. (Paris: E. Droz. 1935 [1936]. Pp. xxx, 358. 60 fr.)

THE primacy of the Low Countries in the medieval cloth industry has long been recognized, but unfortunately no adequate study was ever made until Dr. Laurent published this work. It deals with Flanders (including Artois, the Amiénois, Lille, Orchies, and Douai, Brabant, the Liégeois, and Hainault and considers only the export from these regions to France and the adjacent Mediterranean lands of Spain and Italy. The opening section sketches the industry from earliest times and will prove a welcome summary. Then follow two chapters on the role of Arras and the Champagne fairs, which had a very important export connection with Genoa. There is a sketch of the cloth industry of Mechelen (Malines), which, although situated in the heart of Brabant and belonging to the bishop of Liége, nevertheless had a history, so far as the manufacture and export of cloth were concerned, very much like that of the great towns of Flanders. The student should use G. Espinas, *La draperie dans la Flandre française au Moyen Age* (1923) and like works, for the writer limits himself to the problems of export and disregards almost entirely those connected with production.

On pages 115–117 the reader will note with pleasure a penetrating analysis of the economic motives which underlay the political problems of the reign of Philip the Fair. This period witnessed profound changes which, Professor Laurent declares, amounted to a revolution and imparted a new bias to the political orientation of Flanders and Brabant and Hainault at the opening of the Hundred Years' War. He modestly describes these views as a hypothesis, but if so it is very substantially founded. Philip the Fair's relations with the Low Countries are worthy of the most careful study because in them new problems arose, many of which we associate with the Hundred Years' War. The overland connection between Flanders and the Champagne fairs

was broken. Venetian and Genoese galleys now sailed directly to Bruges and Antwerp by way of the Strait of Gibraltar, the economic dependence of Flanders upon England became more strongly emphasized than ever, and the hostility of Flanders to the crown of France was correspondingly heightened. The towns of Brabant were able to draw an unexpected advantage by turning to the French king, with whom their duke, John III, made a noteworthy treaty at Saint Quentin in 1347. The Flemish cloth industry declined steadily during this century, while the Brabançons irresistibly invaded the monopoly which the Flemings so long enjoyed.

The last five chapters, forming the second part of the study, deal with problems and aspects of the cloth business so far as they concern export. In them the author discusses the different colors, dimensions, selvedges, seals, packing, exhibition for sale and methods of sale at the place of production, methods of transporting cloth, fairs, and the many juridical aspects of the cloth trade. The author is to be congratulated on the completion of a book so richly documentated and illustrated at many points by apt quotation from sources, many of which have never been published.

*The University of Washington.* HENRY S. LUCAS.

*La pecia dans les manuscrits universitaires du XIII^e^ et du XIV^e^ siècle.* Par JEAN DESTREZ. Album de planches. (Paris: Jacques Vautrain. 1935. Pp. 104, 36 plates. 455 fr.)

THIS latest work of Fr. Destrez, which has recently been crowned by the Academie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, is of much wider interest than its title suggests. It is the most important work of recent date concerning the history of the book, bringing to light a wealth of fascinating information about the evolution of the book through the rapid development of the universities in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. It is also of capital importance for medieval palaeography and for editors of those Latin texts which were studied in the medieval university.

The author's research centered in the *pecia* and the exemplar. The exemplar was the copy of a text approved by the commission of *peciarii* named by the university. This officially adopted text was placed in a bookstore, to be loaned to the masters, students, and professional scribes. The exemplar remained unbound, in quires. A quire of the exemplar was known as a *pecia* or piece. The scribe rented, at a price determined by the university, one *pecia* at a time. By this method a number of scribes were able to copy different *pecie* of the same text at the same time. The difficulty of making a sufficient number of copies rapidly was thus partly overcome.

Many scribes, professional or otherwise, noted in the margins of their new manuscripts the beginning or end of each *pecia: incipit pecia decima, explicit pecia quinta,* etc. It is due to these indications of the scribes in their copies made from the exemplar that Fr. Destrez has been able to study the

evolution of this fundamental institution of medieval bookmaking. He places the beginnings of the use of the *pecia* in the period 1225–1235. Its use lasted into the early fifteenth century. Fr. Destrez studied especially those manuscripts written at Paris, Bologna, Oxford, and Naples. In his researches he found thirty exemplars and over one thousand manuscripts containing indications of *pecie,* in the seven thousand odd manuscripts studied.

A chapter is devoted to a study of the palaeography of these university manuscripts. Here the characteristics of the manuscripts of each university are described: the parchment, the format, writing, ink, miniatures, etc. With his vast experience Fr. Destrez has been able to come to many important and interesting conclusions permitting more precise information regarding the dating and the origins of the manuscripts of these four universities.

Finally there is a chapter on the importance of the *pecia* in textual criticism, in which the author explains its role in classifying manuscripts for an edition. The new light thrown on textual criticism by Fr. Destrez's discoveries cannot be overlooked by editors of texts containing indications of *pecie,* even though it may complicate their work.

The volume is published with thirty-six plates, excellently reproduced. It is to be considered as preliminary to the publication of the vast amount of material which the author has gathered, particularly concerning the palaeographical characteristics of the manuscripts and the use of the *pecia* in editing texts. It is to be hoped that nothing will delay him in publishing the fruit of such solid and scholarly research in a field in which he is the foremost authority.

*The University of Notre Dame.* JAMES A. CORBETT.

## MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*European Civilization: its Origin and Development.* By Various Contributors. Under the direction of EDWARD EYRE. Volume IV, *The Reformation.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. 754. $5.50.)

THIS volume on the Reformation is badly proportioned as a part of a series on the history of European civilization in that the British Isles receive as much attention as the Continent. The British section, it is true, is better done. The Continental half has been entrusted to L. Cristiani, who treats the German Reformation in the style of a Denifle but without his scholarship. To select *pecca fortiter* as a summary of Luther's faith (p. 58), to cull the most rabid utterances from his tracts against the peasants and describe them as less violent than others (p. 81), to recount the most ludicrous episodes from the entire career of the Genevan Consistory as "mere crumbs of its weekly activity" (p. 119)—this is not playing ball. Inaccuracies are not infrequent, and bibliographical information is not up to date. In the section on the French wars of religion the revolutionary aspects of Calvinism are played up and the political activities of the Jesuits minimized; the massacre

of Vassy is palliated, while the connivance of Coligny in the assassination of the Duke of Guise is regarded as almost certain. With the transition from the Reformation to the Counter Reformation the tone shifts from polemic to hagiography, and there are some excellent sketches of the leaders. But the author is at his best when he forsakes religious for military warfare. The accounts of the battle of Lepanto and of the defeat of the Armada make good reading.

Very different is the work of F. M. Powicke, who brings to the English Reformation an extensive knowledge of the Middle Ages, which enables him to relate the Reformation to its antecedents and to balance maturely the maintenance and the breach of continuity. The sketches of Gardiner, Cranmer, and Pole are admirable.

W. E. Brown's essay on the Reformation in Scotland finds the causes of the movement not in the abuses of the Catholic Church but in the attempt to correct them. Pilfering nobles and priests in concubinage rebelled against the authority which sought to curb them, and succeeded with English aid in gaining control of the government and enforcing their scheme on the people. Such an explanation fails to make clear why men should regard one celebration of the mass as worse than poison or why they should prefer the galleys to bowing in the temple of Rimmon. Moreover, if the causes of the Reformation were so sordid and so slight, how shall we account for the passionate Presbyterianism of the seventeenth century? Again, the author's interpretation of Luther as relying on "private revelation", and of Calvin as "presenting a religion entirely independent of tradition" would have seemed preposterous to both of them.

The story of the Reformation in Ireland from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century is as sad a tale as that of Alva in the Netherlands. Myles V. Ronan tells it with restraint.

The last chapter, by Christopher Hollis, on "Religious Persecution" is devoted mainly to the Middle Ages and seeks to palliate persecution by magnifying the social menace of heresy and minimizing the cruelty of the church. Only a few pages remain for a superficial sketch of persecution and liberty in the sixteenth century. Incidentally, Castellio had not been "condemned by Calvin as a heretic and exiled from Geneva, thinking himself fortunate to escape with his life". He was merely denied ordination to the ministry and left the city of his own accord with a letter of recommendation from Calvin.

*Yale University.* ROLAND H. BAINTON.

*Monumenta humanistica Lovaniensia: Texts and Studies about Louvain Humanists in the First Half of the XVIth Century.* By HENRY DE VOCHT, Professor in the University of Louvain. [Humanistica Lovaniensia, IV.] (Louvain: Charles Uystpruyst. 1934. Pp. xxx, 753. 50 belgas.)

Those who know Professor De Vocht's *Literae Virorum Eruditorum ad Franciscum Craneveldium, 1522–1528* will welcome this new publication of manuscripts concerning Louvain Humanists. The documents were found during the Great War, when De Vocht's interests were of necessity changed from teaching to the work of an archivist. The papers here published relate chiefly to John Louis Vives, Martin van Dorp, Gerard Morinck, and Erasmus.

For Vives, De Vocht works out a clear presentation of his six visits to England and his relations with Henry VIII, Catherine of Aragon, and English men of letters. As Wolsey's Reader in Latin, Greek, and rhetoric, he resided at Corpus Christi College, and was largely responsible for the change in curriculum at Oxford. His writings were well known because of his many friendships, and translations of his prayers and meditations were later included in the *Book of Common Prayer*. He became involved in the divorce case because the queen's confidences to him were known, and he was imprisoned for thirty-eight days and released only on condition that he leave the country. The documents include letters from a devoted Oxford student Helyar, a letter of Vives to the king, of July, 1527, Vives's evidence in the divorce case, demanded by Wolsey before his release in 1528, and Rodrigo Manrique's letter to Vives of December, 1533, which helps to prove that Cop's rectorial address to the University of Paris was his own and not Calvin's writing—an important point in the conversion of Calvin. A "puzzling letter" is most ingeniously divided by De Vocht into parts of a letter of 1533 by Vives to Gilbert Cousin and one of 1525 to Claud Cantiuncula.

Martin van Dorp's *Apology to Meinard Man* of 1521 is important as giving us a statement of his views on teaching and research. His attitude toward Humanism changed—he was at first very favorable, then fearful of the changes it brought, and so writing for antagonists of Erasmus, and finally supported Erasmus openly in the last years of his residence in Brabant. The document has been hitherto unknown and is published by De Vocht with a description of the manuscript, its history, a summary, notes, an account of Meinard Man, the reforming Abbot of Egmond, and Dorp's dedication to Man of Hadrian Florentii's *Questiones Quotlibetice*. It is followed by the life of Dorp by his student Gerard Morinck, published here for the first time from the original in Morinck's hand, and a calendar of Dorp's correspondence, giving, in full, letters which are rare or very valuable. These and other materials are used by the editor for a long account of Dorp, his parentage, education, relations with John Briard Atensis and Meinard Man, his teaching, his quarrel with Erasmus over the *Praise of Folly* and the study of the New Testament by comparison of the Vulgate with the Greek codices, More's intervention in a long letter of October 21, 1515 (though he calls it *epistolium Laconicum*), confuting Dorp by passages from his own writings, and finally, Dorp's recantation by the publication in 1519 of the oration which in 1516 had introduced his lectures on St. Paul.

Besides the many references to Erasmus in the accounts of Vives and Dorp, there is an important contribution made by the correspondence of Gerard Morinck. These letters tell us much of the conditions of Erasmus's work and life in Louvain, for which we had had only the comment of his own writings. They give us also the varying impressions made by him on his contemporaries. That Morinck was independent in judgment we know from his life of Adrian VI, his characterization of Cardinal Pole and Stephen Gardiner, and his witness is therefore the more valuable.

Professor De Vocht has throughout added most interesting commentary. The biographies are necessarily brief, and though properly critical, they are sympathetically presented, and the subjects live for us.

The book is clearly arranged, well printed, and equipped with a full index, long bibliography, detailed "list of contents", and chronological list of texts. The editing is in English, corrected by an English friend of De Vocht's, but the influence of French, Latin, and Greek still shows, and we have such delightful bits as the sentence (p. xviii): "Documents came to light, which but for him would have continued their secular sleep." So little more correction would have lost us this!

*Wilson College.* ELIZABETH FRANCES ROGERS.

*Registres du Conseil de Genève.* Publié par ÉMILE RIVOIRE et VICTOR VAN BERCHEM. Tome XII, *Du 1er juillet 1531 au 30 juin 1534 (vol. 24 à 27)*. [Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève.] (Geneva: the Society. 1936. Pp. xii, 692.)

IT is now thirty-six years since M. Rivoire published the first volume of the journals of the Geneva town council. With the publication of one more volume, which is now in press, the great work will be complete, covering the years from 1409 to the advent of Calvin in 1536. The editors have done their work admirably. Copious notes and supplements add to the value of the minutes of the proceedings of the council. Though these excellent journals have long been known in manuscript to historians of Geneva, they were never either easily accessible or fully understood, until they had been exhibited to the public in the present form. As reviews of previous volumes have called attention to the special matter offered in them, it is only necessary for the present reviewer to bring out a few of the salient points in the twelfth volume.

The town council combined the functions of a board of aldermen and of a national government. The bulk of the business that came before the rulers was concerned with criminal and civil suits, the regulation of morals, hygiene, commerce, admissions to citizenship, elections, inheritances, finance, taxes, police, public works, and sumptuary laws. In addition to that, they sent embassies to their allies and neighbors and received embassies from them. During the years just before the rule of Calvin, questions concerned with

religion began to become urgent. Every reader of these journals will be struck with the intensely practical and opportunist nature of the government's policy. As far as possible, the rulers seemed to wish to hold themselves neutral and to decide all confessional matters with reference only to the public peace and to justice in individual cases. They would not make any law with reference to the keeping of Lent, but they were obliged to take notice of a complaint of a pastry cook against the butchers for selling meat during the fast, by which the petitioner's business had suffered. They neither forbade nor encouraged Bible reading; but when they were confronted with the licence of the French Bible of Olivetan, they allowed it to be printed. Finally, they were obliged to take measures to keep the peace when riots broke out in which the Catholics and Lutherans accused each other of mutual insult. This matter became more and more pressing as Geneva's allies, Berne and Fribourg, took an active part in the propaganda. Many pages of the journals are devoted to accounts—often very lively—of the orations of the ambassadors of these cities and of the replies of the Genevans.

The only great name that appears in this volume is that of Farel. The names of Erasmus, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Luther, Melanchthon, and Calvin are not even mentioned. But Farel, under the protection of a passport from Berne, preached actively, effectively, and provocatively. He came before the town council with a complaint against a ropemaker named Bernard, for calling him a "schimatic heretic". When Bernard withdrew his words and declared that he regarded Farel as a preacher of God's word, the matter was dropped. Later, his preaching was made a matter of charge by Fribourg, which asserted that he had acted contrary to the terms of the alliance of the two cities. On October 3, 1532, he and two "Lutheran accomplices" were banished from Geneva by the bishop's council. Among the additionad documents here printed are a letter of Charles V, urging the Geneva government to maintain the old faith, and a letter of Hugues Vandel of Berne describing the war and peace of Cappel.

*Cornell University.* PRESERVED SMITH.

*A History of the Parish of Penn in the County of Buckingham.* By J. GILBERT JENKINS. (London: Saint Catherine Press. 1935. Pp. 210. *7s. 6d.*)

AMERICANS will be immediately curious to learn whether William Penn lived in the parish which bore his name. His connection with it is apparently not established.

The parish of Penn, having a poor soil, was settled late. Every self-respecting English parish should be in Domesday Book, but Penn's history begins only in the late twelfth century. For the medieval period there are the usual extents, account rolls, tax assessments, and views of frankpledge. For the sixteenth century there are tax lists. The later centuries gave to

Penn, as to other parishes, churchwardens' and overseers' accounts. All of these are quoted more or less briefly in this book. In the overseers' accounts we find payments made to "Great Bellyed Women" to pass on and have their bastards in other parishes so that Penn might have as few infant charges as possible. Truly a moving scene this, but common enough in eighteenth century England.

A local history may be valuable chiefly to local residents. The author of this book is interested in his environment and in the history of his district. The drawings show the interest. Being in heavy black and white they give us little idea of the texture and at times little notion of the size of the buildings. All in all, however, these drawings give distinction to the book.

If a local history is to be of value to outsiders, it must be presented so as to provide us with a comparison with another locality, or it must provide facts from different periods of its own history so that we may compare one period with another. Mere description or quotation from local records is of little general value unless the goal is comparison in some form. On the whole, we may judge that this parish was pretty much like most others. Now, how many typical parishes need to have their histories recorded?

The one distinction, apart from the pictorial illustrations, that the book might easily have had, would be a description and analysis of recent development. Penn has suffered the horrors of suburbanization. It is too near London to escape. Here would have been an excellent opportunity to present firsthand information. Moreover, this description would someday be hallowed by being a chapter in history. Learning from life is as hard for the local as for the general historian. There is no good reason why such a local history should virtually end with the eighteenth century.

*Harvard University.* N. S. B. Gras.

*El Consejo Real y Supremo de las Indias: Su historia, organización, y labor administrativo hasta la terminación de la Casa de Austria.* Por el Dr. Ernesto Schäfer. Tomo I, *Historia y organización del Consejo y de la Contratación de las Indias.* [Centro de estudios de historia de America de la Universidad de Sevilla.] (Seville: M. Carmona. 1935. Pp. xviii, 434.)

Schäfer's introdution is an excellent summary of the rapid development of colonization, at first supervised directly by Ferdinand and Isabella and their deputy, Bishop Fonseca. In chapter I Schäfer describes his discovery in Simancas of a petition of 1502 begging the king to establish in Seville a customs storehouse for the Indies. This request led, on January 20, 1503, to a royal decree establishing the Casa de la Contratación de las Indias, which carried out the suggestions of the petition. Its first great task was the preparation of the armada of 1503, commanded by Pedrarias de Avila; in 1508, Amerigo Vespucci was its *piloto mayor,* succeeded in 1512 by Juan

Díaz de Solís, who discovered the Plata River; Sebastian Cabot replaced him in 1518. Schäfer follows in painstaking detail the bureaucratic development of the Casa. Bartolomé de las Casas's campaign of 1515–1516 against cruel treatment of the Indians resulted in interesting Cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros and Adrian of Utrecht; and when Charles V reached Spain on September 19, 1517, the council was already in process of formation. Charles wrote on March 29, 1519, of "Los de mi Consejo que entienden en las cosas de las Indias"; and on September 14, 1519, we first find the name "Consejo de las Indias".

Cortes's conquest of Mexico necessitated a more clearly defined organization; and Schäfer's careful study of the documents supports Solórzano's express statement that the Consejo Real y Supremo de las Indias was established on August 1, 1524. On that very day were appointed to it Luís Cabeza de Vaca, Gonzalo Maldonado, and probably Peter Martyr of Anglería. Schäfer assembles the decrees defining its powers and traces its finances. The scandals of Peru and Las Casas's unceasing efforts led Charles to a full investigation and overhauling of the council in 1542. Beltrán and Bishop Suárez de Carvajal were penalized, apparently for favoritism, and a series of *ordenanzas* was promulgated, to be posted everywhere in the Indies, even in the native tongues.

Schäfer's richly documented history is fundamental to any understanding of Spanish government in the New World; he neglects no aspect of it, and the book is a mine of unpublished material, especially on the financial and administrative side. He sketches the course and outcome of the council's conflicts with other authorities, both in Spain and the New World, and the firm hand which Philip II kept on it. The volume closes with the reforms of 1691; there are appendixes listing the members of the council and an excellent index. Every student will welcome this authoritative work, eloquent not only of Schäfer's years of research but also of the enterprise of the Centro de Estudios de Historia de América of the University of Seville and its director, José María Ots. The book is published in German by the Iberian-American Institute of Hamburg under the title *Der königliche spanische oberste Indienrat*. . . . May the remainder of the work follow soon.

*The College of the City of New York.* CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

*Mary Tudor.* By BEATRICE WHITE. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1935 [1936]. Pp. xi, 450. $6.00.)

THE professed object of this biography is to redeem its heroine from the title of Bloody Mary. This pious task has been performed more than once already, notably by Miss J. M. Stone in her life of Mary, published some thirty-five years ago. Indeed there is almost nothing in this book which Miss Stone has not said and said on the whole better. This is true even of Miss White's numerous quotations from original sources, which in almost every case will

be found set forth by Miss Stone. Miss White's book is quite free from the Roman Catholic bias which characterizes Miss Stone's narrative—and yet there is something to be said for a Roman Catholic bias when one is writing about a personality whose loyalty to her faith was perhaps her outstanding characteristic. What both books lack is a careful study of Roman Catholicism in England from the break with Rome until the accession of Mary. After Catherine of Aragon's death Mary herself was the first Romanist in England. It has even been maintained that if she had resolutely assumed the leadership of the movement she might have led England back to Rome long before she did. In any case her relationship to Roman Catholicism when it was a proscribed faith under her father and her brother presents many interesting analogies to the Protestant relationship of her sister Elizabeth during Mary's own reign. This story needs to be told. It is perhaps the one important aspect of Mary's life which remains to be told.

Miss White has added nothing to our knowledge of the subject. In her attempt to excuse Mary's persecution of the Protestants she has tried to shift the blame to Mary's privy council. This position is quite untenable. If there is one thing certain about the Tudors—always excepting the boy Edward—it is that they were responsible for their own policies. Mary herself would have been the first to resent any suggestion to the contrary. She may have been wrong in what she did, but if so she was quite ready to shoulder the blame. She believed that she was right. Her great glory, as contrasted with the other Tudors, is that she did what she believed to be right without regard to the consequences. The rest of them were all shrewd opportunists, with a fine eye to the main chance.

Miss White writes well but without distinction. She has an unpleasant way of dragging in irrelevant matter selected often, apparently, in deference to the current presumption that the details of sex relationships are bound to add "spice" to the narrative. It is difficult to justify on any other grounds the insertion of Henry VIII's vulgar comments about the nuptial couch of Ann of Cleves or the unsavory details of Elizabeth's "affair", if it was indeed an "affair", with Thomas Seymour.

*The University of Pennsylvania.* CONYERS READ.

*Richard Cromwell, Protector of England.* By ROBERT W. RAMSEY. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1935. Pp. xv, 239. $4.20.)

AMONG the many contributions to the byways of Cromwellian historical literature those of Mr. Ramsey have been both important and interesting. To his life of Henry Cromwell and his studies in *Cromwell's Family Circle* he has now added a volume on the life of Richard Cromwell which is at once an entertaining piece of historical literature and a much needed addition to our knowledge. The character and career of "Tumble-down Dick" have had but little attention and less approval from historians generally, and his place in history has been determined less by his own actions than by those

of men more unscrupulous if abler than himself. In this present volume Mr. Ramsey has done much not only to illuminate the career of Richard but to rehabilitate him; and from his study one comes with the impression, not new but strengthened, that Richard Cromwell was one of those unfortunate men, of whom there are many in history, born out of their sphere in life and doomed from the beginning to tragedy.

Mr. Ramsey's book divides itself naturally into three parts, which may be described as pre-protectoral, protectoral, and post-protectoral. Of these the most important historically is, of course, the period when Richard was set in his father's place; yet in that period he was, in a sense, the least important of the figures which then occupied the center of the political stage. He was, in fact, little more than a figurehead, and, things being what they were, he could have been but little else. It may be doubted whether even his father could have controlled the situation for long in the then disturbed condition of affairs. Certainly this agreeable country gentleman, wholly unfitted for such a business by nature, training, and experience, was entirely incapable of riding the whirlwind and directing the storm which gathered about the protectoral system in its later years; and the greatest comment and the greatest tribute to Richard lie in the fact that though he was unable to meet his debts he was still held in personal esteem by so many men in the day of his misfortune.

The third period of his life, which Mr. Ramsey entitles the "Interlude", the period from 1660 to 1680, is in this volume, as the author says, "virtually a blank". It was the period of his life in France, from which he returned to spend another thirty years in England as "Mr. Clarke", dying at the age of eighty-six. In a sense this longevity, which was a characteristic of certain members of his family, was one of the most important features of his life. That and his fall from power; and it is in this latter event that Mr. Ramsey makes his most important and in many ways his most interesting contribution to history. There is nowhere, so far as one reader knows, so detailed, so convincing, and so careful an account of the collapse of the Protectorate as is to be found in these pages. That, in fact, historically speaking, seems the heart of the book. For the rest it is the story of a man peculiarly ill-fitted to play the great part thrust upon him. But from the mass of material, hitherto largely unpublished, Mr. Ramsey has written what will probably be the "standard" life of the second Protector. One may hope greatly that Mr. Ramsey may go on to like contributions to the lives of Cromwell relatives like Desborough and Fleetwood and clear the dark ways of the last days of the Protectorate.

*Harvard University.* W. C. Abbott.

*Government and the Press, 1695–1763.* By Laurence Hanson. [Oxford Books on Bibliography.] (New York: Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. ix, 149. $7.00.)

Mr. Hanson's handsome volume has distinct pertinence in view of the furor, spurious and real, over freedom of the press. The terminal dates are those of the expiration of the Licensing Act and the publication of *North Briton,* No. 45. Between those two events the English press often bubbled with lively partisan zeal, and liberty of expression inspired no little attention.

The end of the licensing system in 1695, which enabled the English press to enjoy unique liberty, came less from any burst of enlightenment than from recognition of failure. Some legislative efforts were made thereafter to institute censorship, but these failed. The only checks came through the stamp duties and the law of libel, which, as A. P. Herbert has recently observed, was "exceedingly complicated and wholly unintelligible". This law could be extremely effective and far-reaching. In 1711 and in 1754 men were punished for aspersing the Glorious Revolution, and in 1729 a bed-ridden woman was made responsible for a libel printed in her shop. Yet, as Swift suggested, to write anything libellous about the K—g of E——d was not considered criminal. Hence brevity gave way to verbosity, directness to indirectness, as a means of avoiding penalties.

The countless restrictions of the law did not necessarily always operate in fact, but on the other hand the law could not only be administered in the arbitrary ways already noticed; it could justify opening mail. That more persons did not suffer was in large measure due to professional loyalty among printers and writers. Those who so far forgot this loyalty as to give evidence for the crown suffered complete and bitter ostracism. The convicted libelers, to be sure, went to the pillory, but this from being a cause for shame became a certificate of achievement. Under the circumstances, the administration of the law distinctly lacked success. Moreover, at such times as the government felt itself firmly established it seemed easier "to let lying dogs sleep" than to flatter them with martyrdom. Perhaps because of this the quality of press struggles fell off after 1730. Men even at times reported parliamentary debates unhindered, for as Henry Pelham may have said, "Let them alone; they make better speeches for us, than we can make ourselves."

As is not unnatural, the government had a less interesting press than the opposition, though it was more widely read through its greater distribution. Despite many efforts the government never succeeded in getting competent official spokesmen. Many pamphleteers favored the government, but these preferred their own mediums of expression. Steele, for instance, once tried to edit the official *Gazette,* but not for long could he tolerate its timid and cautious policy. In fact, the government itself preferred to buy off its critics than to fight them through the press.

For the most part, Mr. Hanson is content to relate the main outlines of his rather narrowly defined problem. He permits himself few judgments. Two of his rare judgments, on Harley and Defoe, agree with those of W. T. Laprade, whose recent *Public Opinion and Politics in Eighteenth Century*

*England* touches the broader aspects of Mr. Hanson's study. He praises Harley's broad grasp of domestic and financial affairs; he applauds Defoe as a great writer with a mind too comprehending and a pen too fertile to remain single-minded in an important controversy. The reader who wishes to form his own opinions, however, can find plenty of references in Mr. Hanson's large and comprehensive bibliography, which reveals how exacting and varied is the research antecedent to study of this sort. In his appendixes the author prints John Toland's proposals for regulating newspapers, some legal data, some financial accounts of newspapers, and a most interesting set of "Directions for the Printer of the National Journal how to place or Range the Articles of News".

*The University of Missouri.* CHARLES F. MULLETT.

*Public Opinion and Politics in Eighteenth Century England to the Fall of Walpole.* By WILLIAM THOMAS LAPRADE, Professor of History in Duke University. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. viii, 463. $4.00.)

AN article, "The Power of the English Press in the Eighteenth Century", written several years ago by Mr. Laprade, expresses what was evidently his motive in writing the present volume. "The activities of the politicians and of the writers for the press must be considered together if we are to understand either." The whole article would be a suitable introduction to this later work.

Although Mr. Laprade has followed the plan suggested in the article, the result is disappointing, for while the article leads one to expect penetrating insight into the political and journalistic life of the period, the book leaves one with an impression of patternless detail. The author has not selected his facts with discrimination or arranged them coherently. Isolated items from the social history of the period, intended as the proper setting for the main theme, break the thread of a narrative, tenuous at best. For example, the following announcement interrupts, but contributes nothing to, the story of the South Sea Company fiasco: "Saturday, August 19, Stanhope's wife gave birth to twins" (p. 250). Amidst the confusion of such irrelevant matter it is difficult to discover a pattern of events. The average reader would profit by the explanation or omission of obscure allusions; the scholar would be as well served by the relegation of many quotations, personal names, titles of pamphlets, and other details to the footnotes; and all readers would gain inestimably if Mr. Laprade had shared more generously with them his own reflections and interpretations.

Disappointment arises partly from the fact that public opinion and politics are dealt with in a strictly limited sense. The public, according to Mr. Laprade's interpretation, was the mob; opinion was but passion; and politics was merely the struggle among great men for power. The press was the instrument by which politicians sought to influence the passions of the

mob. In approaching the subject of public opinion Mr. Laprade is on highly debatable ground. While some of his fellow historians go so far as to deny the existence of public opinion in the eighteenth century, others would doubtless take exception to Mr. Laprade's restricted view of the subject. The author is consistent in this view, and by confining his discussion largely to the attempts of politicians to influence opinion through the press, he avoids embarrassing issues. In the discussion of politics the author is on more certain ground, but he limits his field either by omitting altogether or barely touching upon such important topics as patronage, elections, and the management of the House of Commons, and such influential factors as the merchants and the bankers. The picture of political life thus presented is only part of the truth and is likely to be misleading.

Disappointments aside, there is much of value in the book. The author has collected within two covers information from a multitude of sources. It is scarcely true, as the publishers assert, that he has brought together "hitherto inaccessible material", for the sources of his book are printed and are available in our larger university and public libraries. They consist largely of the printed correspondence and memoirs of contemporaries and of journals and pamphlets. He has not taken advantage of the manuscripts so effectively used by other recent students of eighteenth century politics. In spite of the comparative availability of his material, there is, of course, an advantage in having on one's own bookshelf so much information concerning the political and journalistic history of the first half of the eighteenth century. Although Mr. Laprade has accomplished less than one might wish, his work is more than that of merely bringing together information. His most useful contribution is the study of journalism as the tool of the politician; important, too, is the discussion of rival factions contending for political power.

The style is very uneven. The first chapter is carefully phrased, and the ideas are clearly presented. Although its rythmical cadences may prove monotonous, it shows evidence of polishing, as the following chapters do not. Throughout the larger part of the book the meaning is often obscured by ill-chosen words or loosely constructed sentences, and except for occasional reversions the rhythmical style is abandoned.

The method of annotating, grouping together references for several pages, is not altogether satisfactory, especially for one who wishes to find the exact source of a particular quotation. Citations are not always accurate. For example, the reference to Basil Williams's "The Duke of Newcastle and the Election of 1734" should be Volume XII instead of Volume XIII of the *English Historical Review* (p. 364, n.). The index is full and through the subtopics under certain headings sheds an amazing amount of light on obscurities in the text.

*Wilson College.* D. M. Clark.

*Journal of the Commissioners for Trade and Plantations . . . preserved in the Public Record Office. January 1741–2 to December 1749; January 1749–1750 to December 1753; January 1754 to December 1758; January 1759 to December 1763; January 1764 to December 1767.* (London: H. M. Stationery Office; New York: British Library of Information. 1931; 1932; 1933; 1935; 1936. Pp. 510; 503; 473; 464; 484. $8.40 each.)

FIVE volumes of this series have appeared since the Board of Trade Journal was last noticed in these pages (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVI, 800). The twenty-six years which they cover included many events of first importance both in the American colonies and in the affairs of the Board of Trade itself. The two intercolonial wars which took place during the period receive little direct attention in the journal, for military matters lay outside the province of the board. Indirectly, however, the wars were responsible for a great deal of the work done at the Plantation Office. For example, international rivalry undoubtedly was a strong factor in the decision of the government to undertake directly the settlement of Nova Scotia with Protestants from the British Isles and the Continent. In accepting the oversight of the project the Board of Trade found itself, for almost the only time in its history, functioning as a definitely administrative, rather than merely advisory, body. The plan itself was conceived by its president, Halifax, in 1749, and its execution was entrusted to the board. During the spring of that year the commissioners and their clerical staff were busy in a way they had never been before, dealing with contractors, advertizing for emigrants, listing them and assigning them to ships, and even going to Portsmouth to see the transports off. On a smaller scale the commissioners' activity in this matter continued into subsequent years. Their businesslike conduct of the whole affair as shown in the journal suggests that the board, under such a president as Halifax and such a head of the permanent staff as John Pownall, might well have been regularly entrusted with broader administrative responsibilities than it ever attained.

The autumn of 1763 was another period of unusually speedy and efficient action. This time the task was the working out of the detailed policies and the preparation of the necessary documents for the administration of the newly-won West and the ceded colonies. The famous Proclamation of 1763, commissions for the new governors, and several important reports were the immediate results of the autumn's work, which must have taxed to the limit the capacities of the clerical staff. Detailed discussion began when Hillsborough took office as president on September 28, and during the next three months the board sat on fifty-two days, and on thirteen occasions held two sessions on the same day. It is interesting to note that the first draft of the proclamation was prepared by the board's secretary, John Pownall, in a single night. It is perfectly clear that the Plantation Office could transact business promptly when it needed to.

So much emphasis has been placed upon the decline of the board's activity during the thirties and forties and upon the revivifying effect of Halifax's appointment as president in 1748 that a consecutive perusal of these five volumes of the journal has particular interest. The general impresssion gained by this reviewer from such a reading is that the importance of Halifax's appointment has been greatly overemphasized, at least in so far as it directly affected the quantity of the board's work. It is true that the journal cannot reflect fully the increase in the personal authority and importance of the president which undoubtedly took place. It is also true that during Halifax's first years the board handled some problems of greater importance than any it had dealt with for some time. But it is not apparent that under him the board met much more frequently or with much larger attendance than before, except for short periods, or that it handled matters with any more care or consideration for the interests of the parties involved. On the other hand, the journal for the last years of the whole period covered shows the beginning of the board's final decline, especially after it was deprived of the control over colonial correspondence in 1766. The commissioners then lost what little power of initiative they had still retained, and a pathetically large part of their time came to be taken up with the mere reading of duplicates of the governors' letters to the secretary of state. One is tempted to generalize from the journal of these twenty-six years and say that the increased importance of the board under Halifax lay chiefly in the field of British politics rather than in that of colonial administration, but that subsequent reorganizations directly affected the machinery of colonial control.

One factor in the situation remained largely unaffected during all these years—the board's permanent staff, particularly in the offices of secretary and clerk of the reports. John Pownall, who held one or the other of these positions from 1745 to 1776, was quite as decisive a force as any of the presidents. Even in the years when its official leadership was strongest, the board could hardly have got along without him; when its personnel was weakest Pownall was probably responsible for most of what it did accomplish. He and the clerks under him furnished continuity to the board's policy and the concrete expression of that policy in the important first drafts of nearly every report, letter, or other paper which went out over the signature of its members. If adequate materials were available, a biographical study of John Pownall would shed much light on the course of British colonial administration and policy during the twenty-five years or so before the Revolution.

The wisdom of printing the complete journal separately from the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series,* becomes even more apparent as it draws within fifteen years of its close. Although the secretaries were not consistent in the fullness with which they reported the board's meetings, there are many extremely valuable passages of detailed evidence at hearings and summaries of the board's conclusions which the present genera-

tion of students might never otherwise see in print. And the continuity of the journal in its present form gives a livelier impression than would otherwise be conveyed of the continuous functioning of the board itself through all its changes in personnel and all its ups and downs of authority and prestige.

*Yale University.* LEONARD W. LABAREE.

*Bussy et l'Inde française, 1720-1785.* Par ALFRED MARTINEAU, ancien gouverneur des établissements français dans l'Inde, professeur au Collège de France. [Bibliothèque d'histoire coloniale.] (Paris: Société de l'histoire des colonies françaises; Ernest Leroux. 1935. Pp. 458. 50 fr.)

THIS book complements the author's five-volume work on Dupleix. So close indeed was the collaboration between Dupleix and Bussy at one time that M. Martineau found it convenient and possible to incorporate virtually verbatim part of his *Dupleix et l'Inde française* in the present study. The new material begins with chapter III, which treats the period after the departure of Dupleix from India in 1754.

As the title indicates, M. Martineau has not written the life of Bussy apart from his service in India. Materials for a biography do not perhaps exist. There is little information on Bussy's early youth, and it is not even known when he first arrived in India, following a sojourn in the Ile de France and in Bourbon. He was at Pondicherry, however, at least as early as 1742 and remained until 1760. After his return to France, the Lally trial kept Bussy in the limelight for several years. Then he drops from sight completely until the War of the American Revolution. Mindful of his success in the Deccan from 1752 to 1758, the ministry at that time selected Bussy to head a military expedition to drive the British from India. He accepted the command, while entertaining considerable misgivings as to its success in view of the inadequate force placed at his disposal. These misgivings proved to be well founded, for the French were unable to shake the power of the British. Bussy did not long survive the peace; he died in Pondicherry in January, 1785.

Such in brief was Bussy's career. Not striking or spectacular as compared with those of men like Dupleix and Clive, it nevertheless has a certain interest. M. Martineau goes so far as to rank Bussy as the greatest figure in colonial affairs under the Old Regime, a man superior to Dupleix in good sense and judgment if not in boldness of ideas. In the cold light of history, however, this opinion hardly seems to be justified, for Clio seldom finds a prominent niche in her palace for men with merely superior good sense and judgment. Bussy certainly did not do great things. He was too much the obedient soldier for that. Diplomatic, well-informed, courageous, this man ably carried out his orders even when he considered them wrong. The conquest of the Deccan is a case in point. Bussy helped to bring about

this conquest despite his disbelief in the value of possessing such territory. Moreover he let the *philosophes* announce to the world the anti-colonial sentiment of the day without coming forward with a tract of his own. This record does not win him high distinction.

Lasting interest in Bussy is likely to center in his famous quarrel with Lally. M. Martineau paints the familiar picture of this affair. Like Bussy, Lally was a brave soldier, but unlike him he was utterly devoid of tact. It would be difficult to imagine a greater blunder than his appointment in the midst of the Seven Years' War to the chief command in India. Lally had no conception of how to deal with the natives in order to obtain their sympathy and support; to him they were nothing but Asiatic blacks. Coupled with this attitude was his jealousy of Bussy, who had himself been considered for the chief command. Small wonder that the two men soon checkmated each other with most unfortunate results. M. Martineau does not assert that Bussy in power might have been able to maintain the French position in India, but one can draw this conclusion. Certainly the Versailles court ruined any chances of success it might have had by the Lally appointment. The execution of Lally in 1766 did not repair the errors of the previous decade.

Those who are familiar with M. Martineau's earlier work need hardly be told that this book is carefully done. It rests not only on various archival repositories in Paris but on those of Pondicherry as well. In these pages one finds no hesitation on the part of the author to announce the fact when lack of material has compelled him to leave gaps in the narrative.

*The National Archives.* CARL LUDWIG LOKKE

*Lafayette comes to America.* By LOUIS GOTTSCHALK, The University of Chicago. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1935. Pp. xiii, 184. $2.00.)

MOST men who play conspicuous parts in great social upheavals are given by their followers a heroic stature appropriate to the high aims that inspire them, but slow-footed Time can usually be depended upon to reduce their stature to the moderate level of what was in fact accomplished. Lafayette has been more fortunate in this respect than any of his contemporaries with the exception of Madame Roland. Playing a conspicuous part in three revolutions, greatness was three times thrust upon him; and the fact that in all three "great days" his motives appear confused and his activities of no great import has battled in vain to dispel the myth that preserves his fame as an outstanding figure in the cause of human freedom. In the volume now published Professor Gottschalk traces the origin of this myth. The myth relates that Seigneur Marie-Joseph-Paul-Yves-Roch-Gilbert du Motier, Marquis de Lafayette (the name itself persuades us that his ancestors must have fought in the crusades), a rich and influential member of the French aristocracy, abandoned the traditional prejudices of his class for the liberal

ideas of the Philosophers, and, as a pledge of his faith, defied his family and his king in order to fight with Washington for the liberation of America. Professor Gottschalk easily demonstrates that this is something more (or perhaps less) than the truth. In a detached and pleasant manner, but with a fine barrage of exact documentary evidence, he tells us that Lafayette's ancestors, far from fighting in the crusades, were but a few generations back no more than *hoberaux,* simple country squires, whom "fortune and wise marriages had at last begun to favor". His wealth alone it was that enabled the Noailles family to contemplate the young Lafayette (the name was not even in the Social Register) as a possible match for one of their disposable daughters: properly groomed and placed he might do them no discredit, except the negligible one of a *mésalliance* contracted for sound financial reasons. And so Lafayette became a Noailles. He had to live with them, had to call the *duc* and *duchesse* "papa" and "mama", had to submit to be groomed by them for a courtier. They got him into their regiment, got him received at court, even had him slated for the high honor of becoming a titled flunkey at the court of the king's brother, the Comte de Provence—a fate which he escaped only by deliberately insulting the great man. He was not, after all, easily groomed.

Frustrated and suffocated, he wished to "escape", to win "glory", to prove to those who regarded him as inferior that an indifferent courtier might possess other virtues than those that distinguished the Duc de Noailles or the Comte de Provence. He might have escaped and won glory in Italy—it was all one to him; but circumstance, and a bit of intrigue on the part of interested persons, destined him for the American venture. If at that time he had even read the Philosophers, he had not espoused their ideas. He did not then love "our dear Americans", or know well what they were fighting for; but he hated the English, and what better way was there for a French aristocrat to win glory than by fighting for the king against the English? Well, it seemed that there was a better way. The better way was to have gone to America not to fight the king's enemies but as the champion of liberty and equality against all kings. Lafayette had scarcely arrived before he learned, from France, that he had in fact come in that character: without winning a battle he was already a great man. He may have been astonished, but it would have required a more resistant intellectual integrity than Lafayette possessed to reject the noble role thus conveniently prepared for him.

Such is the thesis, and it is fully proved. Yet Professor Gottschalk is not one of the professional "debunkers". He does not make the mistake of supposing that because a man's motives and ideas are shaped by his interests the man must therefore be a crook. Admit that Lafayette adopted liberal principles in the first place because they would serve interests that were narrowly personal, it does not follow that he must forever profess them disingenuously. The new faith, embraced for whatever reasons, might in time

be genuinely assimilated; and, once assimilated, it might very well give to the interests it served an impersonal quality. Professor Gottschalk accepts Lafayette on these very human terms. What he afterwards "said and wrote would be, probably without his knowing it, in the new rôle rather than in that of the character he had once actually been. The symbol would slowly become the reality". To what extent the symbol became the reality—this is the central theme for the biographer of Lafayette, as indeed it is for any biographer who wishes to make his subject come alive.

*Cornell University.* CARL BECKER.

*Les Français sous les treize étoiles, 1775–1783.* Par Commandant ANDRÉ LASSERAY. Deux tomes. (Macon: Protat Frères. 1935. Pp. viii, 684. 45 fr.)

THE author of the present work declares that in fashionable French circles the statement, *Il est allé en Amérique avec La Fayette,* is frequently made by persons desiring to claim for an ancestor participation in the American War of Independence. The implication is that every Frenchman who shared in the struggle must have been associated in some way or other with Lafayette, whereas in fact scores of them took part without being connected in any manner whatsoever with that gallant and romantic figure. With the purpose of establishing this point Commandant Lasseray has undertaken to compile a catalogue of Frenchmen who voluntarily enrolled themselves as officers in the American military or naval forces. The task has not been easy. The records are scattered and often defective or contradictory. One and the same man is sometimes referred to by different names, or the name of one and the same man is spelled in different ways. Two men occasionally bear identical surnames. In some instances the adoption of a fictitious title serves to throw the investigator off the trail.

Commandant Lasseray has drawn his data not only from the archives of the ministries of war, marine, and foreign affairs in Paris but from American, English, and Canadian records and from a varied assortment of memoirs and biographies. The names are arranged in alphabetical order, and following each name is a succinct account of the owner's career and services, particularly in America, with possibly some data throwing light upon his motives and personality. Inevitably one turns for comparison to Thomas Balch's *Les Français en Amérique pendant la Guerre de l'Indépendance des États-Unis* (Paris, 1872), where a similar attempt is made to catalogue the French officers serving in the American Revolution. Lasseray has not only had the advantage of Balch's researches but of material either unknown to or unused by Balch. Thus he includes not only names listed by Balch but many additional ones. In numerous instances he is able to furnish a more complete record of the career of a particular officer.

The present volumes also contain several chapters dealing with various

aspects of Franco-American co-operation, such as "Les précurseurs de l'Alliance franco-américaine", "Beaumarchais et le Docteur Barbeu-Dubourg", "La Flotille de M. de Beaumarchais", etc. Some of these contribute little new information; others serve to illuminate obscure incidents or episodes. "Annex" V presents an excellent description of the organization of the Continental army.

*Wellesley College.* E. E. CURTIS.

*A Guide to the General Cahiers of 1789 with the Texts of Unedited Cahiers.* By BEATRICE FRY HYSLOP. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1936. Pp. xiv, 474. $5.00.)

THIS is Dr. Hyslop's third publication dealing with the cahiers of 1789. In her *Répertoire critique* of 1933 she inventoried the cahiers, both preliminary and general, and indicated where the originals or trustworthy copies, if still in existence, are preserved. In her *French Nationalism,* published in 1934, she showed how the general cahiers may be utilized to gauge public opinion on national questions. She now rounds out the series with this excellent *Guide,* which sets forth "in sequence the material pertinent to an accurate use of the cahiers" and incidentally makes available thirty-four unpublished texts.

The book begins with a clear explanation of the complicated electoral process of 1789, picturing it in chart, diagram, and map. The distinction between the preliminary and the general cahiers is emphasized, and the investigator is cautioned not to confuse the two types. Since the preliminary cahiers are chiefly valuable for the study of local conditions, and are moreover so numerous and difficult to control, it seems feasible now to pay greater attention to the general cahiers, which deal mainly with national questions. Six hundred and fifteen general cahiers were drafted, of which 523 are still available in some form. The latter can be studied critically and their reliability tested. "Not all", she warns, "are of equal value as gauges of the opinion of the group which sponsored them. The majority are reliable, but of those extant, seventy-seven (and the colonial cahiers) require some reservation, and twenty-five more should be seriously discounted." Moreover, the fact should not be overlooked that the general cahiers were not equitably distributed over the kingdom on the basis of area or population. Dauphiné, for instance, had only one general cahier, as against many a smaller area which had several.

The appendixes, to which more than two thirds of the book are devoted, contain many invaluable aids. In tables and charts are listed the general cahiers in various combinations, with a view to bringing out all the necessary facts concerning their nature, validity, location, and distribution, so that the investigator can orient himself at a glance. Most welcome is the rectification of the texts of the general cahiers reprinted in the *Archives*

*parlementaires*. This publication, which is notoriously defective and untrustworthy, can now be used, thanks to Dr. Hyslop's *Guide*, as an adequate substitute for the original manuscripts of the general cahiers.

In the course of the author's research a number of unpublished texts were discovered. Thirty-four are here printed. This does not make available in printed form all the general cahiers known to exist, but the five or six remaining are expected to appear soon in regional publications in France.

Researchers in the early part of the French Revolution can not but welcome this *Guide*. It clears away the shadows and ambiguities that have hitherto clustered about a very important group of documents and makes them available as reliable sources. There ought to follow a renewed interest in the general cahiers as gauges of public opinion in France on the eve of the Revolution. Seekers for subjects of doctoral dissertations, take notice.

*The University of North Carolina.* MITCHELL B. GARRETT.

*The Estates General of 1789: the Problems of Composition and Organization*. By MITCHELL B. GARRETT, Professor of Modern European History, The University of North Carolina. [The American Historical Association.] (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1935. Pp. viii, 268. $3.50.)

IN the preface to this study we are told that it was undertaken at the suggestion of the late Professor Fred Morrow Fling. It is an example of the careful and thoroughly documented work of which he was such a vigorous advocate. The major contribution is to be found in the extensive examination that has been made of the pamphlet literature of the period covered. So far as I know, no study has been published which gives so completely the story of the conflict which was waged in the press concerning the convocation of the Estates General. The method adopted has been to quote at considerable length from the more important publications in the order in which they appeared. This method has the disadvantage of necessitating considerable repetition which at times becomes a bit wearisome. But on the other hand it has the distinct advantage of showing the constantly growing demands and strength of the third estate. The voice of the people is revealed in a great crescendo as it influenced not only the formation of the Estates General but also some of its earlier actions. The decision to call the Estates General grew out of the struggle with the parlements over the financial difficulties of the government. The third estate, however, was quick to see its advantage in the situation, for, as one contemporary put it, the *deficit* of the government is the *asset* of the nation.

There were two major issues involved in the meeting of the historic body which had not assembled since 1614. The first was the representation of the respective orders, which developed into the demand of the third estate for double representation or a number of deputies equal to that of the first two

orders combined. The second was the manner in which the assembly should reach its decisions. The privileged groups in general were in favor of the equal representation of the orders and the vote by order, which they defended on constitutional grounds. The third estate, widely divided at first, followed the precedent of the provincial assemblies and finally concentrated upon double representation and vote by head. They based their position primarily upon the importance of the non-privileged classes in the nation. For this reason they rejected the constitutional argument and maintained either that France had no constitution or that, if she had one, it had been so violated and ignored as to be practically useless. In either case a new one was necessary. These divergent views were argued at great length in the pamphlets, and the main points in the discussion are clearly presented. The cahiers as another important source of public opinion have a good deal to say on the method of voting, but the author has not consulted them. This study also shows the general agreement concerning the vote by order, *i.e.*, each order had the right of veto so that one could not be coerced by the other two combined.

Other factors in the meeting of the Estates General, such as the plans of the different ministers, the work of the second Assembly of Notables, the attitude of the court, and the *Résultat* of December 27 are well treated. There are also excellent estimates of Brienne and Necker. It is a question, in my opinion, whether the document which purports to be a secret memorandum submitted to Brienne in June, 1788 (pp. 25, 26), is genuine. The motive for forgery might well be the desire to discredit the government for doing the very thing in 1788-1789 that Brienne was supposed to have been secretly advised to do in 1788 for the purpose of nullifying the efforts of the Estates General. The author might also have given more stress to the growing strength of nationalism, indications of which are to be found in many of the extracts quoted. The work is completed with an adequate bibliography, the most important parts being the manuscript sources and the pamphlets, which are listed in five general chronological groups.

*The State University of Iowa.* GEORGE GORDON ANDREWS.

*French Revolutionary Legislation on Illegitimacy, 1789–1804.* By CRANE BRINTON. [Harvard Historical Monographs.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1936. Pp. xii, 102. $1.00.)

*The Incidence of the Terror during the French Revolution: a Statistical Interpretation.* By DONALD GREER. [*Ibid.*] (1935. Pp. 196. $1.50.)

THE mine from which Professor Brinton's little nugget is drawn is the Boulay de la Meurthe collection at Harvard. The author is interested in the matter less for its own sake than as a convenient demonstration of one of his strongest convictions. He finds that the laws on the subject of illegitimacy

describe a circle: the monarchy distinguished clearly between legitimate and illegitimate children; the Law of Nature momentarily wiped out this distinction in 1793; it was re-established after Thermidor and more sharply defined than ever in the Napoleonic Code. But the discovery which intrigues Mr. Brinton is that we have here to deal not with a conflict between revolutionists and reactionaries, as the classical historians have commonly described it, but rather with a transition of moods in the same individuals. "In spite of the guillotine, there is a surprising continuity in the personnel of French government between 1789 and 1799. We must study, not simply a clash between two bands of men, one inspired by one set of ideas, the other by another set, but the clash between competing ideas and emotions *in the same set of men.*" Humanitarian sentiment swept these honest bourgeois off their feet in the intoxicated moments when the world was apparently being transformed along idealistic lines, but soon the deeply intrenched realities of marriage, family, and property triumphed over pity for unmarried mothers and their children. The monograph thus confirms the theory of Mr. Brinton's earlier study in the social position of the Jacobins, *i.e.*, that they were solid, moderate men who for a while "acted immoderately".

This interpretation seems sound; another illustration would be the contrast between the Declaration of Rights and the Constitution of 1791. Humanity has always been climbing mountaintops and coming down again, though not always quite so quickly. The Kingdom of Heaven of Jesus and his disciples was quite different from the Papal Church; Our Lady Poverty was but briefly revered by the Franciscans as St. Francis intended. One wonders whether modern facilities for indoctrinating youth will make the violent extremes of Russian, German, and Italian ideology last much longer. One is tempted to guess that they will not.

Mr. Greer's book, though caviare to the general, is of inestimable service to the professional student of the Revolution. It is a highly specialized study, equipped with tables of great value. The author sets himself the task of testing the validity of the three major interpretations of the Terror, to wit, the philosophic theory of Taine, the political theory of Aulard, and the economic theory of Mathiez. To this end he adopts the statistical method, inspired thereto by Professor Brinton's work on the Jacobins. His touchstone is the list of those condemned to death between March, 1793, and the end of August, 1794. On the basis of the best available monographic studies he breaks down this list into department totals, finding a high correlation between them and the areas most affected by foreign and civil war. The emerging conclusion in favor of the political interpretation is confirmed by a study of the indictments, the great majority of which prove to be for sedition or some other political offense. Finally, an extremely interesting social classification of the victims, worked out by vocations, yields proof that seventy per cent belonged to the lower classes, thirty per cent to the upper, matching with astonishing precision the social analysis of the Jacobins made by Mr.

Brinton. The verdict is reached: "the split in society was perpendicular, not horizontal. The Terror was an intra-class, not an inter-class war."

On the whole this seems inescapable. But Mr. Greer admits that there is no single explanation and allows some room for mob pressure and economic forces. Perhaps he might have allowed more. The truth is that the Revolution did not last long enough for economic motives to have full play. As long as the foreign and civil wars were deadly perils, the Terror was political. It was only gradually, under Hébertist pressure, that the Robespierrists accepted the theory of economic regulation. The economic motive appears clearly in the Parisian Terror of June-July, 1794, as Mr. Greer admits. The fall of the Robespierrists was clearly accelerated by the fear of property owners that the Ventôse decrees were now to be enforced and might be an entering wedge for worse. If the Robespierrists had won, the guillotine would have claimed more victims, executed ostensibly for counterrevolution or royalism. The indictments cannot always be taken at face value. Granted that the Terror was mainly political, yet it was becoming economic.

*Goucher College.* EUGENE N. CURTIS.

*Barnave ou les deux faces de la Révolution, 1761–1793.* Par JEAN JACQUES CHEVALLIER, professeur à l'Université de Grenoble. Préface de Gabriel Hanotaux. [Bibliothèque historique.] (Paris: Payot. 1936. Pp. 359, 25 fr.)

M. Chevallier has just, but only just, managed to bring about a fusion of scholarship, sound judgment, and literary skill. His book will supplant Miss Bradby's *Life of Barnave* as the best treatment of the brilliant orator of the triumvirate. In his desire to be lively and interesting he has occasionally lapsed, however, into the overexclamatory style too popular in France since the Romantic Revolt. At his best he writes in the fine tradition of Sainte-Beuve; at his worst, in the tradition of Jules Claretie. Rather curiously, he handles with admirable restraint the return from Varennes—an episode that tempts to rhetoric.

The exigencies of the book trade no doubt prevented the use of footnotes and the rest of the apparatus of scholarship. But on every page the discerning will see the signs of good hard work. This is not, save for a few stylistic lapses, a *biographie romancée*. Moreover, M. Chevallier never writes as a partisan. One may suspect that he belongs to the circle of moderate Frenchmen to whom neither fascism nor communism offers much attraction. He obviously finds Barnave on the whole a sympathetic figure. But he treats Barnave's enemies both to the right and to the left with equal fairness. He does not like the atmosphere of the Terror, with which, happily, his subject does not require him to deal at length. Yet he writes of Robespierre without bitterness and with a good deal of psychological insight.

The novelty of the book lies chiefly in its narrative skill, its detachment, and its knowledge of human beings. Miss Bradby and others have done the

spadework, and although M. Chevallier has made good use of newspaper reports, parliamentary material, and memoirs to round out his outlines, he has not unearthed any considerable number of new facts. On Barnave's youth and family, and on his Dauphiné background, he has, however, made some important rectifications.

Barnave belongs to the unhappy class of the Kerenskys—the men who help to make, and then try to stop, great social revolutions. Of Protestant origins, a prosperous bourgeois with aristocratic connections, youthful and personable, a natural orator, he was the incarnation of the daring, hopeful generation of 1789, for whom the world was reborn on July 14 and August 4. But neither by temperament nor by social origins was he a fanatic, a stormer of heaven, a true sans-culotte. M. Chevallier excels in analyzing the process—so short in time, so long in events—by which this bitter enemy of the monarchy became one of its last supports. The process was not simple enough to be a mere disillusionment, nor was it quite the acquisition of political wisdom. Indeed, Barnave's moderate stand in 1791 was far from wisdom in the Machiavellian sense. But it was a process that involved an increasing awareness of the complexities of society, and above all, of the limitations of logic as a tool in the governing of men. Barnave, as one can see in his *Introduction to the French Revolution,* written during his imprisonment in 1792-1793, came to a very realistic appreciation of the place of the class struggle in the French Revolution, of the relation between its ideals and its achievements, of its steady approach to a dictatorship of the military hero. He could not, however, bring himself to use this wisdom. Escape, emigration, were always possible, right up to his final incarceration in Paris. Yet he refused to take this way out. To the end he was the optimist and the stoic, in his own way as much as Condorcet a true descendant of the ***philosophes***. All this M. Chevallier has seen clearly and has let us see, too, as a tragedy.

*Harvard University.* CRANE BRINTON.

*Le Vieux Cordelier de Camille Desmoulins.* Édition complète et critique d'aprés les notes de ALBERT MATHIEZ. Avec une Introduction et des Commentaires par HENRI CALVET. [Les classiques de la Révolution française, publiés sous la direction d'Albert Mathiez et Georges Lefebvre.] (Paris: Armand Colin. 1936. Pp. 314. 32 fr.)

To the "grands coupables" of the Revolution Henri Calvet now adds in this relentlessly just exegesis of the *Vieux Cordelier* the name of Camille Desmoulins. The affirmation of his "crime" had long been made by Mathiez; Calvet piles Ossa upon Pelion in this inexorable indictment which pitilessly destroys the traditional portrayal of Camille as a spoiled irresponsible and irrepressible gamin. The *Vieux Cordelier* was not a cry of grief but "the calculated trickery of a pamphleteer at the end of his tether". Camille's plea

for clemency was not disinterested (not even original, for Calvet conclusively proves that the most famous passage is a brazen plagiarism), and the *Vieux Cordelier* was a political weapon, a tissue of coherent and logical political views, a dangerously subtle program of opposition to the governing committees.

The establishment of a complete and critically edited text of this revolutionary journal, then, is only the lesser of the services that the editor performs. He goes far beyond the work of literary emendation. Each issue is meticulously examined for its political attitude, the arguments are critically analyzed, the immediate repercussions on public and governmental opinion are evaluated, and the probable consequences, had Camille's (and Danton's) campaign proved successful, are carefully discussed. This of course is the very core of the editor's approach. Accepting as he does the Mathiezian premise concerning Robespierre and Danton—as all students must, at least in its broader aspects, if not in the entirety of its details—he was compelled logically to begin with an assumption of Camille's guilt. If a real Camille were not guilty in 1793-1794 of the charges now leveled against him, a fictitious Camille would have had to be invented in order to maintain the general thesis of Mathiez. But what logic demands, Calvet's researches have furnished—overwhelming, irrefutable proof of Camille's "crime", of systematic opposition to the government, lowering popular morale, depreciating the responsible leaders of the government, and defending those whom they attacked. If this were a crime, says Calvet, then Camille was guilty. Whether he deserved the death penalty for it, however, is not for the historian to say.

Specifically, the argument runs briefly as follows: the first number, appearing in the thick of the government's sally against the Hébertists and the *parti de l'étranger,* gave Camille and Danton the opportunity to clear themselves from suspicion. But the former went further: by placing Robespierre in a position where he might reject Camille's offer of co-operation, the latter put himself in the strong position of being able to rally the opposition against the government. Numbers 2 and 3 continued these tactics, the famous third number almost openly bidding for the support of the moderates. Robespierre's direct rejoinder forced Camille, in number 4, to beat a retreat from his advanced position though not to abandon his questioning of the legitimacy of the governmental policy. The angry *brio* with which the Parisian *sectionnaires* welcomed this issue determined the apologetic tone of the following number, but to cover his retreat Camille laid down a barrage of sharp criticism of his personal opponents. This was the climax of his campaign, for in the vigorous denunciations which ensued both at the Jacobins and at the Convention, his cause was doomed. Number 6, the last to appear in his lifetime, was a futile defense, though an analysis of the posthumously printed number 7, as well as of the various unpublished fragments, makes it clear that he had not yet abandoned hope.

*Long Island University.* Leo Gershoy.

*La jeunesse de Guizot, 1787–1814.* Par CHARLES H. POUTHAS, docteur ès lettres, professeur au Lycée Janson-de-Sailly. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1936. Pp. xi, 414. 35 fr.)

IN Guizot, the statesman, there was an odd and, at times, irritating combination of the schoolmaster and the pastor. In the volume under consideration Professor Pouthas is at great pains to present the origins of this dual character. They are found, in all likelihood, principally in two persons, who exerted a profound influence on the character and destiny of François Guizot. Madame Guizot, his mother, was one, and Stapfer, his employer and protector, the other.

A sternness, a strict, puritanical morality, a pride in the Protestant faith, a pride which at times seemed to amount almost to *mépris pour les hommes*—all these things which so characterized Guizot in his later life came, in great part, from his mother. Bereft of her husband, who met death at the guillotine, Madame Guizot, a powerful personality, idolized her son. Jealous, she would possess him, direct his energies, and control his destiny. And this she did until 1805, when he became a law student at Paris. Between 1805 and 1807 there was a constant struggle, a conflict which brought her defeat in 1807, when the son, formerly devoted and obedient, fell under the influence of the Stapfer family, who virtually adopted him.

With this new contact came other influences. Guizot remained Genevan and *dévôt* but became cosmopolitan. Where Protestantism and the strict and narrow code of Geneva had been the supreme influences, German ideas were added. Guizot was introduced into the circle of the *gens de lettres.* Stapfer and Madame de Staël became his guides; Guizot became the ardent intellectual disciple of the system of Kant. This new force did not create a revolution in his ideas; Kant's doctrines re-enforced and developed what he had learned in Geneva. Through Stapfer's introductions he began to frequent the *salons* and to write for the journals, the *Publiciste* and the *Mercure de France.* He became the young champion of a reasoned attack upon the incredulity inherited from the eighteenth century.

His first real contact with history came when, encouraged by Pauline de Meulan (whom he married in 1812), he undertook to edit and annotate Gibbon. He was impressed with Gibbon's vision of history, but he abominated Gibbon's incredulity and doubt. He began to develop a method. This plunge into history was followed by an attempt to publish, in collaboration with Pauline de Meulan, the *Annales de l'éducation,* a review for the study of methods of instruction and scholarship. For this journal he wrote reviews and criticisms and also a series of articles on the great educators, Rabelais, Montesquieu, and Kant.

In 1812 he was requested to write a historical brochure for Napoleon on the ransom of prisoners, a controversy which Napoleon was carrying on with England at the moment. This won him the attention of the government. In the spring of the same year he was named *professeur adjoint* of history

at the University of Paris. Guizot's appointment was shared with Lacretelle. Soon, however, their functions were divided. Lacretelle assumed the teaching of ancient history, and Guizot undertook to teach modern history. Then it was that he began to develop his plan for a history of civilization and to prepare that broader approach to the study of the human race which has, since his time, become the peculiar attribute of the French school.

This book is not a biographical account of the early years of Guizot's life; it is rather the story of the formation of the *esprit* of Guizot. The reader will not find in this work many facts but a full, sometimes tedious, and perhaps too detailed study of influences. At times Professor Pouthas becomes so interested in the biographies and characterizations of the personalities which affected Guizot that he loses the thread of his real theme. But the value of the work should not be belittled. As a study of Guizot's intellectual evolution it is complete, and it has been painstakingly done. It is not, however, the total that pleases, but rather certain chapters, excellently written and beautifully organized, that in themselves are real contributions to a knowledge of the intellectual life of the first decade and a half of the nineteenth century. The reviewer would recommend particularly the chapters on "Genève française", "Guizot au collège et à l'académie", and "Un jeune professeur de la jeune université".

*Yale University.* JOHN M. S. ALLISON.

*A Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe.* By CARLTON J. H. HAYES. Volume II, *A Century of Predominantly Industrial Society, 1830–1935.* (New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. xiv, 1215. $4.50.)

THIS work, as stated in the review of the first volume (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVIII, 739), is not a new edition of Professor Hayes's well-known *Political and Social History of Modern Europe* but a new book altogether. It merits its title, not merely by the insertion of an occasional chapter upon cultural development but by grouping even the political material in large measure around the cultural trends. As will be remembered by readers of the first volume, Professor Hayes maintains this extra-political focus even to the point of dividing his volumes not at the traditional political demarcation of 1815 but at 1830, which he evidently regards as the approximate date at which European society had become "predominantly industrial".

As is usual in his textbooks, Professor Hayes is encyclopedic in scope. This might almost be called world history rather than European history, for no important section of the world fails to receive some notice, although an endeavor is made to interpret happenings in the far corners of the earth in the light of the influence of Europe. Furthermore, instead of dealing in broad general terms with events or areas of secondary importance, at least some measure of concrete detail is injected into practically every paragraph.

Such a book, written with Professor Hayes's accustomed skill, is a marvel

of thoroughness. The student wishing to use it as a work of reference will seldom be turned away without information precise to a degree usually found only in a work several times the size of this. The student making more continuous use of it will feel that he has both the elements and the pattern that make up European history. It is commendable that, in covering so vast a field, so few slips of detail should have occurred. Those noticed by the reviewer are too insignificant to merit attention.

Even more remarkable, perhaps, is the fact that the author has been able, in the midst of such a profusion of factual material, to insert so large an element of judgment into his writing. Under the circumstances, judgments have had to be reduced to as compact a form as possible, but legitimate differences in point of view have not thereby been neglected. Few scholars are qualified to appraise the author's interpretations in all the topics dealt with, but, in so far as the present reviewer is entitled to an opinion of his own, the judgments expressed are marked by balance and good sense.

Admirable as this book is as a work of mature scholarship, one or two questions inevitably come to mind. Ought quite so much detail to be included in any textbook? Will not the student who uses it, unless very experienced, be rather bewildered by the profusion of factual material upon so many topics? And—perhaps more seriously—will not those balanced judgments whose compactness and good sense excite the admiration of the scholar be imperfectly understood or missed altogether by the inexperienced student, who is probably not ready to appreciate how much wisdom has been condensed into a sentence or two?

One wonders also whether in a history of Europe, even if it be interpreted as a history of Europeanization, too much space has not been given to events rather remote from Europe, as for example the more than three pages devoted to the woes of Mexico during the last few years. Professor Hayes's book is a mature piece of scholarship that deserves to be read as a whole. It is to be feared that this possibly excessive thoroughness may tend to deny it that just attention.

But perhaps the answer to these queries may be that we need different types of texts, some very general and some very detailed. Of the type that is detailed and yet, for the intelligent student, far more than merely detailed Professor Hayes has given us a splendid example.

*Swarthmore College.* TROYER S. ANDERSON.

*Lord Palmerston.* By HERBERT C. F. BELL, Professor of History, Wesleyan University. Two volumes. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1936. Pp. xvii, 500; xi, 499. $12.50.)

EXCEPTING Disraeli, Lord Palmerston was the most colorful among the British statesmen of the nineteenth century. He lived long, dying in office as prime minister at the age of eighty-one; he lived with a zest more often

found in the statesmen of the eighteenth than in those of the nineteenth century; and as both foreign secretary and prime minister he was a super-patriot—the idol of the "flag-waving" Englishman. When seventy years old he was called upon to lead England out of the morass created by the war in the Crimea; during the next ten years he was popularly recognized as England's leading statesman; and his death plunged the entire nation into mourning. That a definitive biography of him should have been so long delayed is surprising. This one by Professor Bell meets a real need.

Professor Bell has methodically searched public and private collections of manuscripts in this country and abroad, and he has carefully examined an enormous mass of printed material for facts and suggestions concerning the activities of Palmerston. Successors may traverse the same ground, but they are not apt to cast their nets wider. Unlike Mr. Guedalla, to whose work he pays tribute, Professor Bell is more interested in facts than in atmosphere. He modestly disclaims any ambition to present a "Life and Times"—the work is intended to be a mere political biography. But since a life in politics is inseparable from the "times" of the politician, the author gives more than he promises.

These two substantial volumes add much to our knowledge of British politics from 1807, the year Palmerston entered Parliament, till his death fifty-eight years later. Indeed, the account covering the years 1809-1828 contains more about British politics than it does about Palmerston; and from then on, when he became a political figure of great importance, we learn much about the game of politics. As might be expected, the leaders of both parties are presented in the book. Some come off quite well; others, especially Lord John Russell and Lord Aberdeen, very badly, although the latter was a greater man than he appears in these pages. One suspects that he is seen through the spectacles of "Pam". We also find—and this too might be expected—a large array of diplomatists, British and foreign, and of foreign statesmen. The ubiquitous Princess Lieven, Talleyrand, Bismarck, and a host of lesser lights pass in review. We see many of them from new and different angles; and while the work offers few startling revelations, it shows in clear outline the age of Palmerston in politics and diplomacy; and it gives a full-length portrait of Palmerston the man.

While paying tribute to "Pam's" courage, honesty, and love of freedom, Professor Bell does not gloss over his rudeness, his bullying methods, and his presumptuous pride in being English. The successes scored in Belgium and the Near East, 1830-1841, are not magnified, nor are the failures of his Spanish policy and his defeat by Bismarck minimized. On some points Professor Bell feels that Palmerston has been traduced, of which the most important is the Opium War, sharply criticized by Morley in his *Life of Gladstone*. Professor Bell takes his stand on Morse's account of this struggle and defends Palmerston vigorously but not, in the judgment of the reviewer,

convincingly. The Chinese arguments, restated recently by Dr. P. C. Kuo in *A Critical Study of the First Anglo-Chinese War,* as well as the criticism of Palmerston in Parliament in 1840, deserve more respectful attention than the author is willing to grant them. He is inclined to overstress the sincerity and humanitarianism of Palmerston. True, he resolutely fought to exterminate the slave trade, but both with reference to social reform and Ireland he did little beyond voting for bills sponsored by his son-in-law, Lord Shaftesbury, and offering extra rations on the emigrant ships to the starving peasants from his Sligo estate.

Professor Bell rightly emphasizes Palmerston's sympathy with the nationalist movements of Europe, wherever these did not threaten British interests, but he fails to appreciate the role of commerce in shaping the foreign policy of Palmerston. He was, as Dr. Puryear has shown, aware of the advantages accruing to Britain from the free-trade policy of Turkey; his dislike of the tariff policy of the *Zollverein* most certainly influenced his attitude toward German unity; when he sent Lord Minto on the famous roving mission to teach politics in the homeland of Machiavelli, the tenets of Cobden were included in the lessons; and even such minor issues as that of a free harbor on the island of Gotland and Russian trading privileges in northern Norway engaged his attention and helped to shape his policy.

Readers of these volumes may at times wish that Professor Bell had not been so reticent concerning the private life of Palmerston, and that he had not taken for granted a previous knowledge of several historical incidents. For example, we are referred to Wilson's *Greville* for the famous story of "Pam's" alleged attempt upon the honor of one of the queen's ladies in waiting; it is hardly fair not to include this evidence since presumably it was for this reason that the queen called him "the immoral one", an expression quoted in several places. The affair of the lorcha *Arrow* and the Clanricarde issue (I, 167, 178, 180, 184) are shown to be important, but they are not fully explained. The treaty of November, 1855 (II, 138), whereby Britain and France guaranteed the territorial integrity of Sweden and Norway, would have been easier to understand if attention had been called to the fact that Palmerston had for nearly twenty years been on his guard against a possible Russian seizure of northern Norway. Among the few factual errors noticed are the statements that Peel in 1846 did away with all duties on corn (I, 368) and that the big political issue early in 1855 was "a new secretary at War" (II, 115).

Few British statesmen have been endowed with such an abundance of physical energy and have worked so untiringly while in office as did Palmerston. Nevertheless he does not rank among the great administrators. Professor Bell mentions some changes wrought by Palmerston as secretary at war—none very significant. In an era of great administrative reforms his contributions were few. It is evident that his mind was fertile in devising ex-

pedients, but it was not fruitful in ideas. Professor Bell has written gracefully about a statesman who has been called a "giant"; perhaps he was; he certainly occupied a great place, though he owed much to time and tide. If he could have seen himself as depicted in these pages, he would have accepted the praise and the blame in good humor, but he would have exploded with wrath over Professor Bell's Gallicisms.

*The University of Wisconsin.* PAUL KNAPLUND.

*Mazzini: Portrait of an Exile.* By STRINGFELLOW BARR. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1935. Pp. viii, 308. $2.75.)

THIS biography, characterized in places by wit and charm, is not a significant contribution to the extensive literature on Mazzini. Too much attention is paid to Mazzini's relations with Judith Sidoli, while his intellectual antecedents, the different currents in the Italian nationalist tradition, and the main forces in the Risorgimento are rather summarily treated. The book fails to come to grips with some of the outstanding problems faced by Mazzini, such as the organization of Italy on a federalist or unitary basis, the relationship between nationalism and Roman Catholicism and between democratic and socialist internationalism. The contrast between Mazzini's and Carlo Cattaneo's or Giuseppe Ferrari's republicanism—Cattaneo and Ferrari are not even mentioned—Mazzini's struggle with Marx and Bakunin —in many ways a titanic struggle involving great personalities and great issues—and his denunciation of the Paris Commune are virtually ignored. The author notes that most of Mazzini's teachings "fit the pattern of the twentieth century far better than the pattern of the nineteenth" (p. 263), but his failure to discuss Mazzini's relevance to the present century is rather serious in view of the claim now being made in certain quarters that he was a precursor of fascism.

Since Professor Barr has a chapter entitled "Judith", he might have devoted more than cursory attention to the hotly-debated question of whether or not she had a son by Mazzini (see, for example, pp. 65, 113, 280 n. 36). A full and candid discussion of Mazzini's relations with women (Jane Carlyle among others) would have been welcomed in view of the considerable Italian material on this subject. Professor Barr does not refer to the rumor that Ernesto Nathan, the anti-clerical mayor of Rome, was Mazzini's illegitimate son. This rumor, incidentally, was given currency by Benito Mussolini in one of his prewar blasts against the Mazzinians and the republicans. In speaking of Mazzini as Don Alberto's pupil (p. 6), without furnishing any authority for his assertion, Professor Barr commits the blunder of perpetuating a legend about Mazzini's youth, begun apparently by Jessie White Mario in her well-known life of Mazzini. As Professor Gaetano Salvemini clearly showed in his *Ricerche e documenti sulla giovinezza di Giuseppe Mazzini* etc. (*Studi Storici,* vol. XX, 1911), Mazzini's teacher was

Don Luca Agostino Descalzi, not Don Alberto. This important work by Salvemini is not included in Professor Barr's bibliography. When Mazzini wrote of Alfieri as a "Misogallo", he meant Vittorio Alfieri, not Marquis Alfieri di Sostegno, as Professor Barr seems to indicate in his index. The name of the Tuscan satirical poet is Giuseppe, not Carlo, Giusti (pp. 16, 279 n. 16). Surely the date of Mazzini's birth could have been mentioned at least once in the text instead of being relegated to the "chronology" in the back of the book.

Professor Barr's bibliography is not as selective and useful as it might have been. The most serious omission is Nello Rosselli's distinguished work, *Mazzini e Bakounine* (Turin, 1927). William Lloyd Garrison's essay on Mazzini, Alexander Herzen's *Memoirs*, the masterly pages on Mazzini by the great literary critic, Francesco De Sanctis, Edmondo Solmi's *Mazzini e Gioberti* (Milan, 1913), Alessandro Levi's *La filosofia politica di Giuseppe Mazzini* (2d ed., Bologna, 1922), Giacomo Emilio Curatolo's *Il dissidio tra Mazzini e Garibaldi* (Milan, 1928), and Armando Lodolini's *Bibliografia mazziniana* (Milan, 1932), with all its unfortunate defects, deserved mention. Since Professor Barr leans heavily on Mazzini's *Epistolario* and letters, he owed his readers a critical word about persistent rumors in responsible circles concerning the suppression of or tampering with certain letters of Mazzini. He should have studied this subject and thrown some light on it.

Mazzini still awaits a student who can give us an exhaustive account of his life and also of his times, on the basis of the latest scholarship and in the light of the contemporary and particularly of the Italian scene.

*The College of the City of New York.* GAUDENS MEGARO.

*Italy in the Making.* Volume II, *June, 1846, to 1 January, 1848.* By G. F.-H. and J. BERKELEY. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. xvii, 374. $6.00.)

As the title indicates, this stout volume is a history of eighteen months. It covers only the prelude to the revolutions of 1848 in Italy. No treatment of the Risorgimento on such a scale has been attempted before in English. In justification the authors appeal to the thesis that when a revolutionary tension exists every step becomes more fateful; they also believe that by closer examination of detail they can "obtain virtual certainty of the truth" about each move.

This volume, like its predecessor, shows what can only be described as an anxiety of emphasis on plan, an earnest desire to simplify and clarify a confused and confusing subject and explain everything clearly. With the election of Pius IX the authors see the "five chief factors" of the previous volume—Reaction, Revolution, Moderation, Piedmont, and the Papacy—becoming polarized around the liberal program initiated by the new pope. This program and Pius IX are the main themes of the book.

What the authors are most anxious to emphasize is the statesmanship of

Pius IX, the sincerity and nobility of his effort to reconcile the claims of liberalism and patriotism with the interests and authority of the church. They are ready to admit that he was swept off his feet by forces that he unleashed but could not control, but they seem to feel that they have redeemed his title to statesmanship by making it clear beyond peradventure that in his public and private declarations he never failed to give fair warning that he could not and would not democratize the Papal State or take up arms against Austria unless subjected to an armed attack.

That Pius IX had a noble plan, attended with colossal difficulties, is a thesis that deserves reiteration, though it is one that would hardly be contested. Indeed, all the main positions taken by the authors have been well established. They have let themselves be guided chiefly by the older authorities, such as Gualterio, Farini, Spada, Tivaroni, Masi, and Gori, whose conclusions they sift and compare, but to whom at times they completely surrender their pages, quoting long passages from them in translation. In the archives they have studied the material in the Fondo Spada (Vatican), the dispatches of Lützow to Metternich (Vienna), of Rossi to Guizot (Paris), of Bargagli, the Tuscan representative at Rome, to his government (Florence), and those of certain English officials in Italy (Public Record Office). They have also read some of the leading journals published by the Liberals and many of the important collections of letters and memoirs that are in print. By careful use of all these sources the authors have not only found material to strengthen and round out their thesis at many points but have shown convincingly that Metternich's plan of defense against the impending revolution did not, in 1846-1847, include offensive action in Italy, even at Ferrara. Metternich comes off well in this fresh review of his insights and plans. In the Kingdom of Naples, following Guardione and Paladino, the authors also give Ferdinand II a rehabilitation that he deserves and quite properly put that kingdom outside the main currents of the movement towards unification.

The authors have lived much in Italy and made the Risorgimento a subject of "lifelong study". They are amateurs of it, in the best sense of that word. They are conscientiously trying to put their tangled subject in order, and in this they have succeeded. But with all the merits that have been mentioned, their book has failed to open new avenues of approach to its theme, and, in the opinion of the present reviewer, until the avenues of approach in which the modern mind tends to move and raise its questions have been opened and explored, a book in English on the scale of the present is a mistake. It will necessarily remain preoccupied with the interests of writers for whom the issues were charged with a political anad patriotic significance too intense for an analysis satisfying to us. The present volume will be of value to the teacher seeking a clear outline. To the specialist the authors will too often seem to be laboring the obvious, and the general reader is likely to feel that he is being lectured to by professors and turn to livelier, if less reliable, stuff. Clearness has been achieved but at a cost of what repetitions and of a

regimentation under general ideas which deprives the events of too much of their attractive reality. As for the hero, Pius IX, we are left about where we were by the famous words: "They have tried to make a Napoleon of me who am but a poor country priest." If he had been a great statesman and a less amiable man, he would either not have attempted the impossible or, like Cavour, would have found the means by which to achieve it.

*The Johns Hopkins University.* KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD.

*Un bourgeois français au XIX^e siècle: Baroche, ministre de Napoléon III, d'après ses papiers inédits.* Par JEAN MAURAIN, agrégé d'histoire, docteur ès lettres. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1936. Pp. xv, 526. 40 fr.)

ENTERING the service of the state as opposition deputy in 1847, Jules Baroche rapidly lost sympathy with the liberal cause he had been chosen to uphold. The apparition of socialism turned him into one of the state's most avid red baiters and despisers of radical republicanism. Fortunately for him the Second Republic needed a man of his opinion and of his legal training (he had had a very successful career at the bar before going into politics) and appointed him *procureur général*. So successful were his prosecutions of radicals that the Prince President decided to appoint him minister of the interior. From that day in 1850 until the fall of the Empire he rendered unremitting political service to his chief, holding important posts in the council of state, the cabinet, and the senate.

As "a bourgeois conservative and defender of private property, *laissez faire*, and the Gallican church", he became more authoritarian than the emperor himself and on a score of occasions was forced to champion liberal imperial policies of which he did not approve. Time after time he appeared before the lower house as spokesman for the council of state to support a foreign policy he privately detested and to operate the official steam roller in behalf of distasteful legislation. This willingness to act as imperial yes man certainly goes far to account for his long and uninterrupted tenure of office. But it does not explain all. As liaison officer between executive and legislature he performed his duty with devotion and uncanny success, and whatever rewards came to him were more than deserved.

Although the author does touch upon the private life of Jules Baroche, his biography is largely a description of the imperial servitor. His treatment is sympathetic and scholarly. Not only does he avoid the all too obvious and shallow characterization of Baroche as a political opportunist, but he also stays clear of apologia and panegyric. Basing his work in great part on new documentary material from the Archives nationales and Bibliothèque Thiers and upon his already proven knowledge of the Second Empire, he has realized a splendidly original and impartial study. From the book emerges a figure of great political importance, too long shaded by the established reputations of Rouher, Walewski, and Haussmann.

*Yale University.* SHERMAN KENT.

*England and the Near East: the Crimea.* By HAROLD TEMPERLEY. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1936. Pp. xxx, 548. $10.00.)

THIS first volume of a series which will eventually extend to the Congress of Berlin surveys in detail the policy of Great Britain in the countries comprising the Ottoman Empire from the battle of Navarino to the outbreak of the Crimean War. A synthesis of virtually all sources essential to the subject, some of them not previously employed, by a conscientious and distinguished scholar, it is indispensable to a knowledge of a field which heretofore has been the scene of doubt and controversy. The subject is a difficult one. Professor Temperley remarks "that the Eastern Question can only be understood if we know how orientals intrigue, how western diplomats negotiate, and what Balkan peasants think about". That he himself possesses a thorough understanding of these factors and of the entire European background as well is quite apparent in the penetrating and significant observations which everywhere abound in the text and in his masterly comments on the sources.

To treat adequately even the major developments in this field, the author has been compelled to omit or at most to dwell briefly on numerous aspects of the European diplomacy of the period. "Constantinople commands the finest strategic position in the world", he explains, "and remains the centre of the picture" (p. vii). Observing British interests and activities in the Near East from this point of vantage, he has set forth estimates of individuals and of situations which not infrequently differ measurably from traditional views. Palmerston, one of the outstanding figures, scarcely gains in stature from this review. He remains the skillful gambler and opportunist and not always the great statesman, to be sure. But it is now evident that for a period of several years he failed to perceive that essential British interests, such as the route to India, might require more than naval supremacy in the Mediterranean. His hesitation in coming to the aid of the sultan in 1832 appears to have been due to his uncertainty as to whether British needs might not be served as well by an alliance with Egypt. Certain it is that he persistently misunderstood Russian and Austrian aims and motives throughout the period of the Turco-Egyptian contest, if not later.

The picture drawn of Mahmud is not so familiar. This frequently maligned sultan is shown to have been a well-intentioned and capable despot, whose plans for improving the state of his realm were extensively hampered by the disloyalty of his provincial governors, Ali of Janina and Mehemet Ali of Egypt, in particular. The author's disinclination to grant these pashas the smallest measure of justification as rebels prompts the observation that in the last analysis historical estimates of motives and character must inevitably vary according to the criteria applied. In any event the statement (p. 91) that "in 1839 Mehemet Ali forgot his caution and England turned against him" is open to question. The reviewer believes that the pasha very deliberately decided to embark on a course known to be full of great risks because

of the conviction that the chances of the attainment of his objectives would never be greater during his lifetime. Also the accomplishments of the British forces during the Syrian campaign against Ibrahim Pasha are certainly overrated, in view of Ibrahim's instructions from Egypt and his realization of the futility of attempting to oppose the British by force of arms.

Another example of historical revision is noteworthy and perhaps yet more striking. Stratford de Redcliffe (whose likeness supplies the frontispiece) here at long last comes into his own. Far from being the vengeful contriver of the Crimean War, he now emerges as the friend of Russia, stanch advocate of reform in Turkey, and apostle of peace among the powers. The legend of the "inexorable Stratford" is traced to the machinations of Reschid Pasha. Professor Temperley "doubts his [Stratford's] wisdom" at times but emphasizes his "noble and devoted efforts [which] produced major concessions in words but minor concessions in deeds". The fact appears to be established that Aberdeen was the foremost of that misled group whose ineptness provoked the "international catastrophe" at a time already made critical by the failure of reform in Turkey and revolts in the provinces.

The book maintains a high standard alike in scholarly achievement and in literary excellence. Since almost a fourth of the volume is devoted to critical and explanatory notes on text and sources, doubtless it was judicious to place the bulk of these—a few appear on the pages to which they refer—in a supplementary section. The critical evaluation of the sources, the three sketch maps, and the seven appendixes—essays on difficult or debatable points and excerpts from sources not generally available—are commendable. Exceptionally fine descriptive and analytical passages, however, occasionally alternate with others indifferently done: the greater part of chapter seven, for example, seems hardly to have come from the hand which introduced the chapter with such a magnificent picture of the Lebanon. Imperfections of any kind are happily few, and to mention them in a brief review seems almost to cavil at a work of great and lasting merit.

*Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.* HALFORD L. HOSKINS.

*René de Kerallain, 1849–1928.* Edited by Avocourt Kerallain. (Quimper: Privately published, Imprimerie Bargain. 1931. Pp. 164.)

*Correspondance de René de Kerallain.* Tome I, *16 décembre 1889–5 mai 1906;* tome II, *6 mai 1906–27 décembre 1909.* Edited by Avocourt Kerallain. (*Ibid.* 1932; 1935. Pp. 397; 420.)

THE late René de Kerallain was a Breton jurist, whose interest in comparative law and custom and, because of his descent from Bougainville, in the Seven Years' War in North America resulted in his becoming a principal agent in translating, criticizing, and otherwise introducing British, Canadian, and American works on these subjects to the French public. As his naturally retiring nature was accentuated by increasing deafness, he grad-

ually withdrew to his ancestral home at Quimper, where he carried on his scholarly work and his extraordinary correspondence. His books and translations are well known, but a very large proportion of his knowledge and wisdom was published in widely scattered reviews and articles which he either did not sign or to which he attached one of some eighteen pseudonyms.

The first of the above volumes contains a foreword by Mme. Kerallain, a brief but suggestive biography by Kerallain's old friend, Paul van der Vrecken de Bormans, a bibliography of 333 items, and some sixty pages of "Témoignages", beginning with Paul Gide in 1877 and ending with Pierre de La Gorce in 1930. The correspondence, of which two volumes have appeared, reflects very truthfully the first twenty years in the life of a true savant. The letters are witty and gay, full of apt anecdote, and marked by the independent assurance which comes from intelligence married to exact, even minute, scholarship. Kerallain's royalism seems to have been responsible for the care he took to interpret French politics to his foreign correspondents, and it is elaborated in his letters to the editors of French periodicals. American historians will be interested in the letters concerning Bougainville and the Seven Years' War, directed to members of the family and to M. le baron Marc de Villiers du Terrage, Sir Arthur Doughty, Cardinal de Cabrières, and Professor G. M. Wrong. Most of the correspondence concerning comparative law and European affairs is with Sir Alfred Lyall, Sir Frederick Pollock, M. de Bormans, M. Henri Mazel (*Mercure de France*), M. Henri Gaidoz (*Revue celtique*), and M. de La Vallée-Poussin (Université de Gand). Mme. Kerallain is to be thanked for the labors which have assembled so thoroughly the elements to form her distinguished husband's monument in the scholarly world.

*Columbia University.* J. B. Brebner.

*Journal d'Alexandre Ribot et correspondances inédites, 1914–1922.* Publiés par le Docteur Al. Ribot. (Paris: Librairie Plon. 1936. Pp. ii, 307. 25 fr.)

Alexandre Ribot, as minister of foreign affairs (1890-1893) and president of the council (1892-1893), negotiated the prewar Franco-Russian alliance. Curiously enough, he was again president of the council (March-October, 1917) when that alliance was being threatened by the course of events in Russia. Ribot, who was born in 1842, had been in retirement for some years when in June, 1914, he was invited by Poincaré, then president of the Republic, to form a cabinet for the purpose of maintaining the *loi des trois ans*. His ministry lasted just three days and gave way to that of Viviani, a person without experience of foreign affairs—to whom a few weeks later fell the direction of French policy on the eve of the Great War. It is certainly conceivable that the veteran Ribot would have been able to give a different turn to the outcome of the crisis. When Viviani reconstructed his ministry in the interests of the *union sacrée* Ribot became minister of

finances, a post which he held for two years and a half. In the critical situation created by the Russian Revolution France needed an outstanding person at the head of her government, and Ribot was a logical choice.

In a small book entitled *Lettres à un ami: Souvenirs de ma vie politique*, published posthumously (1924), Ribot gave a discreet account of his part in the dreary story of French politics from 1914 to 1917. It cannot be said that the statesman's diary and correspondence, which his son has now made available, add materially to the earlier book. As a matter of fact, the more formal narrative is easier to use, for the arrangement is by topics instead of by chronology, as in this book. Nevertheless the numerous documents will be much appreciated by those who wish to penetrate the mysteries of 1917, that is, the various schemes for a negotiated peace. The concluding pages reveal Ribot's views on the Treaty of Versailles and its application; he deemed the financial clauses quite unsatisfactory. The editor is careful to distinguish, by differents kinds of type, between his father's papers and his own explanations.

Ribot was apparently convinced that peace on any kind of terms satisfactory to France and her allies was not possible in 1917, whereas Briand believed that Germany was willing to surrender Alsace-Lorraine! During the negotiations conducted by Prince Sixtus of Bourbon the Austrians declared that Italy had made overtures for a separate peace, but Ribot refused to credit this and loyally declined to negotiate because Italy's claims had been ignored by the Emperor Charles. He would not allow the French socialists to go to the Stockholm Conference because Pétain declared that he could no longer control the army if French socialists began conversations with German socialists. Ribot, it is worth noting, was opposed to the policy of detaching the left bank of the Rhine from Germany. Altogether, his papers leave the impression of a clear-headed, disinterested, and dispassionate man who was thoroughly disgusted by the intrigues and shortsightedness of his fellow politicians.

*The University of Chicago.* BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

*British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898–1914.* Volume X, Part I, *The Near and Middle East on the Eve of the War.* Edited by G. P. GOOCH and HAROLD TEMPERLEY, with the assistance of LILLIAN M. PENSON. (London: H. M. Stationery Office; New York: British Library of Information. 1936. Pp. lxx, 1009. $4.65.)

*Documents diplomatiques français 1871–1914.* Série 3 (1911–1914), tome IX, *1er janvier–16 mars 1914.* [Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Commission de publication des Documents relatifs aux origines de la guerre de 1914.] (Paris: Imprimerie nationale. 1936. Pp. xxxi, 639. 60 fr.)

As these two volumes cover in part the same ground from different angles

(London and Paris), they may conveniently be reviewed together. The common ground is the Balkan situation during the first two and a half months of 1914. It includes such matters as the Liman von Sanders Mission, the disposition of Albania and the Aegean Islands, the control of the Oriental Railway in the annexed territories, and the question of reconstruction loans to all the war-impoverished Balkan states.

As to the last point there is a striking contrast between the English and French attitudes. The British apparently made no loans, and the question is not even mentioned in the British documents except in a very few cases. In one of these, when Sir L. Mallet at Constantinople urged money for Turkey, Grey replied: "I recognize the importance of financial help for Turkey, but I cannot influence financiers here to invest money in Turkey" (*B. D.*, p. 243). In another case, when the Russian and French governments were frantically trying to prevent Bulgaria from contracting a loan in Germany and begged Grey to co-operate with them at Sofia, he made the characteristic minute: "We really cannot do anything. The Bulgarians will ask us to get them money in London and we cannot do that as British finance is not influenced by political motives" (*B. D.*, p. 325). In the end foxy Ferdinand chose to borrow 500,000 francs from the Disconto-Gesellschaft; but he had to submit to onerous terms—five per cent interest with an issue price of 83 and reported concessions for a German tobacco monopoly, construction works, and future orders for German armaments.

France, on the contrary, was very keenly interested in using the financial needs of the exhausted Balkan states as a political lever to pry them into the orbit of the Triple Entente, and as the economic basis for the sale of French warships, munitions, and railway material. Of the 472 French documents no less than 90 deal with loan questions (not including proposals for financing the Oriental Railway and administering the Ottoman Debt). Delay in granting a loan to the Young Turks was used as a pressure argument to make Turkey change Liman von Sanders's contract and to refrain from attacking Greece after the great powers had allotted most of the Aegean Islands to the latter. French loans to Greece and Serbia were accompanied with detailed stipulations (of which the borrowers were frequently reminded by France) as to the purchases which these states were to make from Creusot, Schneider, and other French firms. The gigantic loan to Russia for strategic railways was used as a successful argument with the Russian government to see to it that French munitions interests should prevail over Krupp and Armstrong-Vickers in the Putilov works and the Perm munitions factory. Parity with Italy in making loans to Albania and Montenegro, in order to forward the interests of France and her Serbian financial satellite, was firmly insisted on.

As to the Liman von Sanders Mission, little of essential importance is added to what we already knew. Grey wrote: "I don't believe the thing is

worth all the fuss that Sazonov makes about it; but as long as he does make a fuss it will be important and very embarrassing to us: for we can't turn our back on Russia" (*B. D.*, p. 407; *cf.* also p. 423).

The two most serious complications in connection with the Aegean Islands were, first, the danger that Turkey might make war on Greece if the islands were handed over to the latter and became a focus for agitation among the neighboring Greeks on the Asia Minor mainland; and second, Italy's persistent failure to fulfill her conditional promise under the Treaty of Lausanne to evacuate the Dodecanese. She was profuse in assurances that she would do so but at the same time was secretly very nervous lest Grey should make some public utterance which would pin her down to fulfilling it, because, as San Giuliano said to Rodd: "The English mentality was different from the Italian. Englishmen took words at their face value" (*B. D.*, p. 131). Since the whole question of the Greek islands, as well as Albania, had been dealt with by the London Conference of Ambassadors, *i.e.*, by the Concert of Europe, the Triple Entente powers were much annoyed by the tendency of Italy and Austria to go ahead on their own hook in connection with these two delicate problems. Three times Italy and Austria took public action without a preliminary understanding with the Entente powers. Italy lamely tried to explain that this had happened "by a mistake". Grey, however, was justly indignant. His first impulse was to withdraw the British representative from the Albanian Commission and the British detachment from Scutari, but feeling "that this would create considerable sensation" (*B. D.*, p. 241), after consulting with France and Russia, he continued his thankless efforts for the Concert of Europe.

Aside from the Balkan situation early in 1914, the British documents reveal interesting details in regard to two other important matters: the Potsdam Meeting in 1910 and Anglo-Russian friction in Persia from the dissolution of the Persian Assembly in 1908 to the ousting of Shuster in 1911. In their visit to Potsdam the czar and Sazonov roused the suspicions and fears of England and France by withdrawing their objections to the Bagdad Railway and agreeing to a junction of the Bagdad-Khanikin extension with a future Persian line under Russian auspices (pp. 549-723). Russian military occupation of points in northern Persia and obstruction of Shuster's efforts to reform Persian finance and create a treasury gendarmery greatly embarrassed Grey in the face of parliamentary questions and Liberal criticism at home. Sazonov, however, constantly threatened that unless England supported Russia in Persia, it would mean the end of the Entente (pp. 724-900). On several occasions Grey took a pretty downright tone toward the Russians, but in the end, for the sake of preserving the Entente, he instructed Buchanan to "make it quite clear that we have no reason to object, if they formulate a demand for dismissal of Shuster. I don't suggest

it, but it is possible that Russian Government think we have some desire to favor him, which is not the case" (p. 826).

In the French documents new and interesting light is thrown on the serious anxiety with which the Quai d'Orsay regarded the Anglo-German negotiations for the contingent partition of the Portuguese colonies (*cf.* the *Table méthodique,* pp. xxiv f.). The French were kept fairly fully informed by Grey, but they feared the possible dangers to French vital interests in Africa, and they feared that publication of the Anglo-German agreement would have an effect very unfortunate for France. The government at Paris wanted to forestall and counteract the agreement by co-operating at once with Portugal and Belgium in building railways in Africa with the aid of French capital, which would help checkmate Germany's African ambitions. Paul Cambon in London, however, preferred, wisely as it turned out, the more prudent course of limiting French efforts to persuade Grey not to publish the agreement, hoping that the contingency contemplated in it might after all never be realized. Grey (and Portugal) desired publication because Grey felt it did not accord with British policy to have secret treaties. Cambon finally won his point because Germany's insistence on nonpublication came to his support in his arguments with Grey.

Noteworthy also are the well-written reports of the French representatives in Berlin and St. Petersburg as to the potential dangers of an excited and bellicose public opinion in Germany and Russia six months before the outbreak of the World War. Paléologue, on presenting his credentials and being told of Russia's increased armaments, suggested to the czar that he ought to make a secret military and naval arrangement with England and that Poincaré would probably be glad to initiate the matter with Sir Edward Grey and King George during their coming visit to Paris; this hint led to the famous Anglo-Russian naval negotiations, rumors of which caused such a stir on the eve of the war (pp. 414-417). Doulcet, counselor of the French embassy in St. Petersburg, pictured vividly the nationalist intrigues of Krivoshein and his friends in ousting Kokovtsev from office and the anti-German feeling excited by Germany's supposed encirclement of Russia—German employees in Russian factories, Germans stirring up Sweden and Denmark against Russia, increasing German economic influence in Turkey and the Balkans, and as the last straw the Liman von Sanders Military Mission at Constantinople (pp. 334-346, 581-587, 591-594). Sazonov, he asserts, had tried to make friends with Germany at the Potsdam Meeting, but "one can do nothing with an imperialism as voracious and aggressive as German imperialism" (p. 593). It was this nationalist indignation and the rapid increase of armaments in Russia which led Dr. Ulrich to sound his famous warning to Germany in the *Kölnische Zeitung* of March 2, and this in turn aroused a bitter Russo-German newspaper feud which the two governments

did little to moderate. Doulcet's denunciation of German imperialism reminds one a bit of throwing stones from a glass house when he reads in the British documents of Russia's barefaced imperialism in Persia and the ousting of Shuster.

*Harvard University.* SIDNEY B. FAY.

*Die internationalen Beziehungen im Zeitalter des Imperialismus: Dokumente aus den Archiven der Zarischen und der Provisorischen Regierung.* Herausgegeben von OTTO HOETZSCH. [Herausgegeben von der Kommission beim Zentralexekutivkomitee der Sowjetregierung unter dem Vorsitz von M. N. Pokrowski. Einzig berechtigte deutsche Ausgabe Namens der Deutschen Gesellschaft zum Studium Osteuropas.] Reihe II, Band VIII², *5. August bis 16. Oktober 1915.* (Berlin: Reimar Hobbing. 1936. Pp. xviii, 850. 42 M.)

THIS volume of documents from the Russian archives brings the story of war diplomacy through the events leading to the Entente declaration of war on Bulgaria in October, 1915. Its 495 documents, of which only 47 have previously been published, deal with nearly all the same subjects as the earlier volumes in this series (see the review of the first five volumes, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLI, 753). Especially interesting, among these subjects, are the efforts made by the Entente to win the active support of the Balkan neutrals, Greece, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Threats, promises, bribery, and propaganda were all used. The difficulty was that each of the three countries demanded a huge price for its aid, and the price was always territory that belonged to the other neutrals or to Serbia, already engaged in the war. The problem evoked much correspondence and impatience and showed itself to be too great for the diplomats to solve. A change came when Venizelos came to power in Greece and invited the landing of Allied troops at Saloniki, promising to make only a formal protest against this violation of Greek neutrality. Although the air was cleared a bit further by Bulgaria's mobilization and declaration of war on Serbia, new problems arose: the resignation of Venizelos, the very real fear on the part of the Greeks of the troops at Saloniki, the refusal of Greece to give promised aid to her ally Serbia when attacked by Bulgaria, the necessity of placing a check on Serbia to keep her from weakening her northern front by diverting troops to the south against Bulgaria, and the need of redoubled efforts to persuade Rumania to cooperate actively against the enemy.

Other regions of the world are treated in these documents but with far less detail than the Balkans. Much is shown of the rivalry in Persia, with England and Russia committing every possible breach of Persian neutrality to advance their interests. Sweden is pictured as at last more or less satisfied with the assurances given her by England in regard to her trade and by Russia in regard to the Åland Islands. Japan appears in the documents as

a country willing to supply Russia with munitions at a price and ready to fish in the troubled waters of China, where the overthrow of the young republic was being plotted. Russia also took advantage of the weakness of China to strengthen her position in Outer Mongolia and to begin scheming to obtain for Russian citizens in Northern Manchuria rights similar to those acquired by Japan under the Twenty-one Demands. The United States is mentioned two or three times, but only as a source of credit and munitions and not as a possible ally.

Although a common cause engaged the Allies, none of them seemed to forget special goals. We see Russia at work on a plan for administering the yet-to-be captured Constantinople in a way that would establish her dominant position there, despite the fact that no Russian troops participated directly in the military efforts made to take the Straits. Italy had her own aims to pursue in the Balkans, very largely at the expense of Serbia; and she refused to supply Russia with arms unless Russia worked in London to get a loan for Italy. France and Russia were not always in agreement: the French press bitterly criticized Russia for sending no troops into the Balkans, while Russia opposed the French desire to have Japan send troops to fight in Europe. There is also evidence of internal difficulties in Russia and their possible bearing on the outcome of the war.

Conspicuous by omission are the ideals which propaganda used to make the war popular.

*Yale University.* HARRY R. RUDIN.

*Peace in the Balkans: the Movement towards International Organization in the Balkans.* By NORMAN J. PADELFORD, Professor of Government, Colgate University. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. ix, 209. $2.00.)

THIS is a very brief, popular essay which deals primarily with the story of the Balkan Conferences, 1930-1934. These conferences, which were made up of representatives of Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Jugoslavia, Rumania, and Turkey, though unofficial in character, laid certain broad foundations for a solution of the manifold political, social, and economic problems in the Balkan region and pointed the way toward a possible Balkan confederation or union. They represent a hopeful development in the region of southeastern Europe. Professor Padelford introduces his volume by tracing briefly the birth of a "Balkan ideal"—the ideal of unity or confederation—from the nineteenth century to the opening of the first Balkan Conference in October, 1930. He then analyzes the course of the four conferences which have been held. Chapter V purports to tell the story of the formation of the Balkan Entente of February 9, 1934, to which Greece, Jugoslavia, Rumania, and Turkey adhered, and relates this understanding to the wider developments in recent European diplomacy. A final chapter, which raises the question

of war or peace, indicates that both the Balkan Conferences and the Balkan Entente have made valuable contributions to Balkan life and should be continued. The movement, the author says, "remains one of the most unusual and hopeful developments of international affairs".

While Professor Padelford's work is a useful summary of a very promising movement which points to a possible solution of many problems, the volume distinctly lacks historical perspective in its tracing of the idea of confederation. Moreover, as a brief analysis, it lacks that completeness which it ought to have. It stresses the political aspects of the problem at the expense of the many social, economic, and intellectual phases of confederation—questions which were fully discussed and studied in the conferences and treated by the Balkan Entente as well. The maps, of which there are two on a single page, lack precision. The documentary appendix, containing seven selected documents, is useful so far as it goes, but it lacks the pertinent materials dealing with social and economic questions which a student of these problems ought to know. The bibliography mentions only three books on the subject, one of which is a Bulgarian pamphlet in French of only forty-eight pages. Professor Padelford might well have listed six volumes of documents which have been published by the various conferences through the *Dotation Carnegie*.

While these criticisms of the work are serious, the book remains a useful, if popular, summary of a movement which has laid excellent foundations for the peaceful development of the Balkan countries.

*Miami University.* HARRY N. HOWARD.

*Dictatorship and Democracy.* By SIR JOHN A. R. MARRIOTT, Honorary Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. ix, 231. $3.75.)

*Dictatorship in the Modern World.* Edited by GUY STANTON FORD, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Minnesota. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1935. Pp. 179. $2.50.)

To all attempts of political science to comprehend a contemporary problem of such proportions as that of dictatorship *vs.* democracy definite limits are drawn. Within these limits the two books under consideration are a considerable contribution. Both of them approach their subject in a formally objective manner though without concealing an underlying sympathy for democratic and liberal institutions.

In emphasizing the role that the leader's personality plays in a fascist state and in stressing the importance of the World War and the peace treaties for the rise of dictatorships in many countries, Sir John Marriott is on safe ground. But whoever undertakes to explain fascism and national socialism as creations of ambitious men or mainly as postwar phenomena and caused

by essentially political factors runs the danger of forgetting that the World War itself was perhaps an inevitable event in the sequence of economic developments, that the capitalist nation-state may need war under certain conditions to maintain itself, and that the mythical figure of the leader may well be an essential part of the political mechanism of a highly developed capitalistic society. That the struggle of dictatorship *vs.* democracy, as it presents itself today, might have something to do with the evolution of capitalism, that fascism, apart from many other aspects, might also be devised to protect the economically powerful—*Junkers,* bankers, industrialists—is not discussed in this book. Such an approach would be too Marxian, and from Sir John Marriott's "objective" point of view "Marxism is an urban philosophy conceived by a bookworm immured in a library" (p. 177). There is hardly one important statement in Sir John's book that cannot be questioned. Consider, as a single instance, his assertion, with reference to Italy in 1922 and Germany in 1932, that society "seemed in imminent danger of disintegration" (p. 214).

In all the articles contributed by different scholars in Professor Ford's book there is present a keen understanding of the concurrence of economic and noneconomic forces to bring about dictatorships. Hans Kohn, in a chapter in which he tries to compare communist and fascist dictatorship, considers it "an oversimplification to interpret fascism only from the economic standpoint, as the last stage of decaying monopoly-capitalism" (p. 146). Harold C. Deutsch, in "The Origins of Dictatorship in Germany", paints the "single solitary figure of the leader, the man of the new age, the legitimate son of his time" as a new phenomenon harmonizing manifold historical precedents and national traditions, approximating the Spenglerian ideal of the lonely ruler ". . . even though we may be dealing with nothing more than the latest expedient of the old ruling classes in their efforts to rehabilitate themselves". Here the fundamental question is thrown open for discussion. In Max Lerner's article, "The Pattern of Dictatorship", the materialist and determinist school of thought is most clearly represented. The writer does not, however, prove the statement found so frequently in contemporary political literature that large banking houses and steel manufacturers such as Thyssen gave financial support to Hitler and Mussolini. The origins and history of the Mussolini regime are described by Henry R. Spencer. His treatment is realistic and comprehensive, although he seems to underrate the imperialistic determination of the fascist regime, indeed of large parts of the Italian people. In forty-two concise pages Professor J. Fred Rippy gives an excellent and dramatic account of the lives and general background of the more important Spanish-American dictators. Machiavelli's *Principe* seems to have found his ablest and most colorful modern disciples in the Spanish-speaking parts of the New World. A brief and interesting summary on all major European dictators and dictatorships by Professor Ralph H. Lutz and

a final chapter on "The Chances for Democracy"—not too encouraging, however, for believers in democracy—by a British scholar, Mr. Denis W. Brogan, complete this interesting and informative volume.

*Washington, D. C.* FRITZ ERMARTH.

*A Place in the Sun.* By GROVER CLARK. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. xv, 235. $2.50.)

A casual expression employed by Bülow four decades ago and eagerly seized upon by contemporary German imperialists on the lookout for a catch phrase provides the title for this timely study of the actual role of overseas possessions in national economy. Have the familiar claims in favor of empire building—that colonies assure supplies of essential raw products, afford stable markets where foreign competition need not be a perpetual bugaboo as well as areas for fabulously profitable investment, and provide important outlets for surplus population—proved valid in the light of actual experience? Long personal observation in the Far East, where he was stationed as a journalist, caused doubts to arise in Mr. Clark's mind, and after meticulous case studies of British, French, German, Japanese, and Italian experience during the past half century, his answer is an emphatic "No!"

A preliminary section sketches the modern expansion movement. The traditional arguments in support of colonial effort are then dealt with in turn. The author draws heavily upon official statistics appearing in a multitude of government publications and amasses a devastating array of facts to make his point that modern imperialism has not paid. Only his general conclusions can be given here.

In not a single instance has the tiny driblet of emigration from any country to its colonies had an appreciable effect upon population pressure at home or upon the condition of the common people there. In colony after colony, irrespective of the motherland, the costs have been substantially greater than the profits arising from commerce. A few merchant princes, large-scale bankers, and armament manufacturers have piled up fortunes, but the lot of the average citizen has been to pay more taxes; overseas holdings are always in the red.

The development of colonial sources of supply and dependence upon them has actually imperiled the mother countries because communication lines are easily cut in times of war. As for investment, colonial enterprises have proved to be bottomless sinkholes for capital, and returns from them as a whole have been conspicuously below those obtainable at home with far less risk. And lastly, colonies have become such a menace to world peace that only the frank adoption of an open-door policy under international control can avert disaster for the parent states.

Fifty elaborate statistical tables, compiled by Mr. Clark, supporting these

startling conclusions have been simultaneously published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace under the title *The Balance Sheets of Imperialism* (Columbia University Press).

*The George Washington University.* LOWELL JOSEPH RAGATZ.

## AMERICAN HISTORY

*Tristán de Luna, Conquistador of the Old South: a Study of Spanish Imperial Strategy.* By HERBERT INGRAM PRIESTLEY, Librarian of the Bancroft Library and Professor of Mexican History, University of California. (Glendale: Arthur H. Clark Company. 1936. Pp. 215. $5.00.)

MOST of us are wont to assume that the Spanish phase of our national and colonial history befell only in the Southwest, California, and Florida. Professor Priestley clearly shows that both the royal government in Spain and the viceregal government in New Spain (Mexico) were keenly aware that a vast realm stretching across the northern side of the Gulf of Mexico and eastwards to the Atlantic coast must be grasped and held to the end that enemies be excluded. In the reign of the Viceroy Antonio de Mendoza (1535–1550) and in that of Luis de Velasco (1550–1564) many brave men were sent forth under Soto, Cabeza de Vaca, and others to prepare the way for Spanish rule.

Professor Priestley, in this brilliantly written book, tells us of the great expedition prepared under the auspices of Viceroy Velasco and led by Don Tristán de Luna y Arellano which, in 1559–1561, attempted to bring under the sway of Philip II all the immense area between northern New Spain and the Atlantic. On the whole it is a narrative of failure. Nearly all the causes of the disaster are vividly presented by the author; but one is astonished to find that the most deep-seated cause of all is hardly touched upon. Thus, although we are fully informed as to the misadventures and indiscipline which marred the expedition, we are not told that the prime factor in the building up of calamity was the nature of Indian society in the region visited. These natives were, at best, only half as civilized as those in Mexico, Yucatan, and Peru. It came about, therefore, that they afforded no solid basis whereon the Spaniards could erect a socio-political structure of their own, as they did in those lands. The only glimpse of this profoundly significant fact that is here given us is the perennial shortage of food. This, naturally enough, wrought havoc among Luna's men, who were depending upon native resources for their sustenance, and so led to much dissension. Moreover, the Indians flitted away from their smoking villages so that encomiendas, as to the nature of which the author seems a trifle vague, could not be established among them as a social basis for the Spanish regime.

Nevertheless, the book is absorbingly interesting, and it has many moving and dramatic passages. True, Catholics will be diverted by the author's habit

of styling ordinary clerics "holy fathers". The worst defect, however, is the almost calamitous lack of any sort of map. This often causes the reader to be as completely lost in that vast terrain as were Luna and his men. In spite of these imperfections one may truly say that Professor Priestley has given us a history of stirring endeavors by Spaniards in what is now the southern portion of our country. For his authoritative and beautiful telling of the story we must all thank him.

*Pomfret, Connecticut.* PHILIP AINSWORTH MEANS.

*The Works of Samuel de Champlain.* Reprinted, translated, and annotated under the general editorship of H. P. BIGGAR. Volume VI, *1629-1632*. Translated by the late W. D. LeSueur and H. H. Langton, the French texts collated by J. Home Cameron. [The Champlain Society.] (Toronto: the Society. 1936. Pp. xvi, 430, xii.)

THIS volume contains Book III of the Second Part of Champlain's 1632 *Voyages,* thus completing the publication of that work, earlier portions of which are contained in Volumes III, IV, and V of the society's edition of Champlain's works. The volume also contains the valuable *Traitté de la Marine at du Devoir d'un bon Marinier,* a summary of discoveries made in New France, identification tables of Champlain's maps, and a number of original documents, chief among them Champlain's Appeal to the King in favor of New France. The translation and collation is admirably done, as usual, and the volume also contains an excellent general index to the whole six volumes of Champlain's works, which should be of the greatest use. It was prepared by Miss J. Jarvis.

The portion of the 1632 *Voyages* here published has never before been translated into English, and the same is true of the *Traitté de la Marine.* The reader now has available in English for the first time Champlain's account of Kirke's conquest of Quebec in 1629 and the subsequent misfortunes of the French there, a contemporary narrative of great interest and value. He also has in the treatise on seamanship the ripe fruit of Champlain's reflection on thirty years of seamanship and exploration in the great age of maritime discovery, which should draw attention to a side of Champlain's work which has not perhaps received as full attention as it deserves, his work as geographer and navigator.

This volume completes the tale of the six volumes of Champlain's *Works* published by the society, the first volume of which was published in 1922. The task of presenting as good a text as possible, together with a translation, has been admirably performed and reflects the greatest credit on the society, the general editor, Mr. H. P. Biggar, and his associates. It is an outstanding achievement of Canadian historical scholarship. There is, however, one serious criticism to be made of the society's edition. Nowhere does it contain any critical estimate of Champlain or his work as explorer, geographer,

colonizer, or writer. The first volume referred to the possibility of publishing a supplementary volume, but there is no sign in this latest volume of any such intention. The brief introductions to the separate volumes are almost wholly concerned with textual matters, and we are not told whether the original documents published as appendixes are all that are available. A full-length biography was perhaps unnecessary, but an introductory (or final) essay on Champlain and his *Works* as a whole would have added materially to the value of what will henceforth be regarded as the authoritative text.

*The University of Toronto.* R. FLENLEY.

*Virginia Historical Index.* By E. G. SWEM, Librarian of the College of William and Mary. Volume II, *L-Z*. (Roanoke: Stone Printing and Manufacturing Company. 1936. Pp. xiv, 1181. $50.00.)

WHEN writing the notice of the first volume of the *Virginia Historical Index,* printed in an earlier number of the *Review* (XL, 519), I called attention to the circumstances under which the idea of the *Index* was first conceived, to the plan according to which it was constructed, and to its value as an aid to a better understanding of the history not only of Virginia and adjoining regions but in many ways of the entire colonial world as well. Now that the second and final volume has appeared, carrying the subject matter from L (Labadists) to Z (Zyperius), I wish to comment somewhat more in detail on certain features that disclose the patience and ingenuity of the editor and the completeness of the work which he and his collaborators have performed.

The entries are printed in three columns to the page of about eighty lines each, the items running from one line to more than forty columns in all. The form of reference is made as compact as possible; for example, the sixteenth volume of the first series of the *William and Mary Quarterly,* page 206, is printed "16W(1)206", with an explanation of the abbreviations appearing at the bottom of every page. In many cases, particularly of proper names, nothing more specific was required, and blocks of such entries appear very frequently. But far more often a few words of description were found necessary, and such descriptions, explaining the nature of the reference, often take up many columns. Twenty-five columns of such itemized statements are given to the Lee family, thirty to the Washingtons, and forty-five to the tribe of Smith. In compiling such groups of names the staff of workers must have found identification a difficult task, involving painstaking research, for there were three William Byrds, eight Ralph Wormeleys, and others in like profusion, the differentiation of whom must often have proved very perplexing.

More useful to the student even than the proper names are the subject entries, such as, "Courts", "Bridges", "Ferries", "Roads", "Ships", "Cloth-

ing", "Arms", "Salaries", "Proclamations", "Labor", "Sales", "Printing", "Prisoners", "Racing", and the like, in which cases the content of each individual reference is succinctly presented. No part of Dr. Swem's scheme is more skillfully contrived than is this handling of the subject references. "Wagons" occupies two columns; "Salaries", six; "Schools", nearly eight; while under "Proclamations" we have an itemized list of every proclamation, as far as recorded, issued from 1613 to 1918, two hundred in all.

As if this were not enough to satisfy the user of the ***Index,*** there is at the end of each of these subject sections a "See also" clause, designed to call the user's attention to particulars separately indexed. Take "Punishments", for example. In the "See also" clause are entered forty-one different varieties of punishment inflicted at one time or another in Virginia, each of which is entered elsewhere. "Utensils (household)" offers an even better illustration. Its "See also" clause covers nearly two and a half columns, listing more than five hundred different utensils for household use. At the end of the clause is a further reference to "Clothing, Furnishing (household), Furniture, Tools". Turning to these sections we are referred to no less than a thousand items more, forming altogether a completely indexed catalogue of all articles of apparel, furniture, and implements for house, shop, and farm that were in use during three hundred years of Virginia's history. Following each of these groups is still another "See also" clause, and so the pursuit goes on, until the entire field is covered. The whole ***Index*** is therefore a monument of thoroughness, and, as far as I have been able to test it, is impeccably accurate.

The *Index* contains also a bibliographical description of the volumes indexed. This "Description", the ***Index*** itself, and Dr. Cappon's recently issued *Bibliography of Virginia Newspapers* (the first volume of a series entitled "Guide to Virginia Historical Materials", a product of the University of Virginia, as the ***Index*** is one of the historical activities of the College of William and Mary) equip the student of Virginia history with tools of precision that are superior to anything provided by any other state in the Union.

*Yale University.* CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

*The Old South: the Geographic, Economic, Social, Political, and Cultural Expansion, Institutions, and Nationalism of the Anti-Bellum South.* By R. S. COTTERILL, Professor of Southern History, Florida State College for Women. (Glendale: Arthur H. Clark Company. 1936. Pp. 354. $4.00.)

*Southern Regions of the United States.* By HOWARD W. ODUM. [The Southern Regional Committee of the Social Science Research Council.] (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1936. Pp. xi, 664. $4.00.)

THE first of these books is a synthesis of the history of the Old South,

bringing together in brief compass a very readable and cogent presentation of what the author believes to be the essential facts in the expansion of the South and the development of Southern nationalism. The most unique feature of the book is the degree to which slavery is minimized, that institution and the controversy which raged about it receiving far less attention than Indian relations. Professor Cotterill accepts the view of Channing that the development of Southern nationalism dates from the Missouri Compromise, but he is unable to account for that controversy in the absence of an antislavery sentiment in the North; nor has he found an explanation for the political alliance between the South and the Northwest. This spirit of nationalism created by the Missouri controversy, the author naïvely contends, continued to unify the South in the absence of any real concern over slavery. Slavery agitation in 1850 was limited to politicians, the people in both sections being unconcerned about it. The Republican party was not antislavery but "primarily anti-Democrat" and could not have been held together for the support of a program in opposition to anything. Nullification had been practiced, and the constitutional right of a state to secede had been affirmed, at one time or another, by every state in the Union. Secession was the result of a prearranged program. The antislavery crusade was a "bogie man" used by the leaders of the conspiracy to frighten the Southern people into its support. Slavery as a cause of secession was only a rationalization, the real motive for Southern action being Southern patriotism.

This thesis, as the author has developed it, has two fatal weaknesses: (1) a complete disregard of social and economic philosophy; and (2) an iconoclasm that frequently approaches flippancy. The humanitarian and agrarian philosophy of the Virginians is not even mentioned. John Taylor's name appears only once, and then as an advocate of the use of manure to restore soil fertility. The reader searches in vain for so much as a sentence about Taylor's great contribution to Jacksonian Democracy, the Virginia attitude of apology for slavery, or the rise of a militant defense of the institution. There is no discussion of the Southern highlanders, and only cursory notice of Calhoun's philosophy, the status of free Negroes, and the colonization movement. The author shows no familiarity with the important work that has been done in recent years on slavery and the antislavery movement. What justification can there possibly be for a bibliography which omits Barnes's *Antislavery Impulse,* Beveridge's *Life of John Marshall,* Boucher's *Nullification Controversy in South Carolina,* Bowers's *Jefferson and Hamilton,* Dodd's *John Taylor of Caroline, Prophet of Secession,* Du Bose's *Life and Times of William Lowndes Yancey,* Flander's *Plantation Slavery in Georgia,* Kephart's *Our Southern Highlands,* Simms's *Life of John Taylor,* Sydnor's *Slavery in Mississippi,* Turner's *The Frontier in American History,* Wertenbaker's *Planters of Colonial Virginia,* and many others? How many historians would agree that Birney was a leader of emancipation in the

North prior to 1820 (p. 143); that there is no evidence that love for the Union had anything to do with opposition to secession in the South (p. 256); that only force prevented Missouri and love of inertia prevented Kentucky from joining the Confederacy? Few students of American literature and of the frontier would feel constrained to speak of William Gilmore Simms in a tone of disgust or to say that the writings of Hooper, Longstreet, and Thompson have no standing as literature. In his final chapter, "The Struggle for Independence", the author reaches the limits of dogmatic interpretation. The mountain people were not devoted to the Union, and their attitude was not embarrassing to the Confederacy. The South expected the aid of the Northwest because it controlled the Mississippi, but Union efforts to open it and Confederate defense of it were both supreme folly. Southern enthusiasm was killed by failure of the Confederate government to launch an offensive war. The great weakness of the Confederacy was its supply of trained military leaders. An assertion of state rights against the Union was justified but had no valid basis within the Confederacy.

*Southern Regions of the United States* is not a history of the South. It is a social inventory of the southern regions of the United States. Notice is taken here of its publication because its scope and the quality of scholarship indicated make it in every way an invaluable aid not only to scholars in the several social sciences but to the historian as well. None can afford to pass it by—few will be disposed to do so after a glance at its comprehensive volume of statistics, factual briefs, and graphic interpretations. Seldom does one encounter such a balanced combination of detail and realistic exposition.

Rejecting the fiction of Southern unity, the authors recognized a sixfold regional division of the United States and confined their study to the Southeast: Virginia, North and South Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas. Several hundred tables, charts, and maps constitute the criteria by which the economic and cultural achievements and potentialities of the region are measured and compared to those of other regions and of the nation. The distinctive feature of the study is its rejection of the sectional approach and its emphasis upon the interdependence of the sections, upon the inseparable nature of national culture and national welfare. Both the debt of the other sections and the terrific drain upon the Southeast in human and material resources through the years appear appalling. This condition constitutes a challenge to the nation, to the section itself, and to man's capacity for planned reconstruction.

*The University of Michigan.* DWIGHT L. DUMOND.

*Peace or War: the American Struggle, 1636–1936.* By MERLE CURTI, Professor of History, Smith College. (New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 1936. Pp. 374. $3.00.)

THE three hundredth anniversary of the founding of our first American

college coincides with the three hundredth anniversary of that "work of the Lord's revenge", the Pequot War. During these three centuries the two irreconcilable rivals for the minds and conduct of Americans, namely, education and warfare, have engaged in an irrepressible struggle. As Professor Curti's book is our first detailed account of that struggle, its importance is obvious.

Its "prospect" includes nine stages, namely, the pioneers (1636–1860); the test of the Civil War (1861–1865); the renewal of the struggle (1865–1885); allies and obstacles (1870–1900); propaganda and pressure (1870–1898); imperialism and world organization (1890–1907); toward victory (1900–1914); the world at war (1914–1918); and the struggle renewed again (1918–1936).

Its "retrospect" reflects upon some factors of strength in the struggle, such as individual and organized propaganda, peaceful substitutes for war, the contempt of liberalism for militarism, and especially a search for and attempted removal of the economic causes of war. Some of the weaknesses of the movement, too, are cited, such as internal division, rivalry, and duplication; the neglect of moral equivalents for war; the surrender of peace principles during the Civil, Spanish, and World wars; the failure to grapple realistically and unselfishly with the economic causes of war inherent in a capitalist system based on a profit-making economy.

These factors of strength and weakness receive innumerable and convincing illustrations in the historical part of the book, which appropriately fills ninety-seven per cent of its pages. The story of the struggle during the present generation occupies almost one half of the space. In this latest phase of the story a baker's dozen of Woodrow Wilson's contributions to both peace and war are cited, but there is no reference to his work at the Paris Peace Conference. The League of Nations, too, is left out of the picture, except for a brief reference to its rejection by the United States and to the current controversy which it has aroused over the question of collective security by means of collective armed force. Our author's final conclusion is that there is no hope for the triumph of peace, unless a new economic order is established which is definitely more collectivistic and democratic; but the story which he has told so well makes it clear that, even with radical economic and political reforms, there can be no permanent peace until the masses of the people cease to be both for war and against it.

One noteworthy feature of the book is a painstaking documentation, page by page and line by line (covering forty-six pages in fine print), which enables almost every statement in it to be verified by detailed references to manuscripts, books, pamphlets, magazine articles, and newspaper columns. If Professor Curti will follow this up by a history of the peace societies themselves (including, besides their activities, the dates and places of their existence, their organization, programs, publications, and present location of

their records, publications, and libraries), he will add to the debt of gratitude we owe him for the excellent history of the peace movement in the United States which he has given us.

*Swarthmore College.* WILLIAM I. HULL.

*Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century.* By SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON. Two parts. [The Tercentennial History of Harvard College and University, 1636–1936.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1936. Pp. xx, 360; xiii, 361–707. $7.50.)

THE work of which these volumes are an installment will perhaps constitute the most important permanent contribution to Harvard's brilliant Tercentenary. It seems unfortunate that these two "parts" do not appear as Volumes II and III of the "Tercentennial History of Harvard", instead of being given a separate title. They are perhaps not so important to the general student as their predecessor (reviewed in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLI, 149), but from the points of view of historical scholarship and literary presentation they are equally well done. They begin with the Charter of 1650, which still serves as Harvard's "frame of government". Except for two brief periods of abeyance, it has been continually in existence for nearly three centuries, thus making the President and Fellows of Harvard College "easily the oldest corporation in North America operating under their original grant".

There are chapters on all phases of college life, institutional vicissitudes, and developments under the last days of the important administration of Dunster, who resigned in 1654, to that of Samuel Willard, who as vice-president conducted the affairs of Harvard from 1700 to 1707. It is interesting to find that Increase Mather, whose terms as acting president, rector, and president, continued from 1685 to 1701, and who is described as the only seventeenth century Harvard alumnus "fairly entitled to the rank of statesman" (p. 515), was so enamored of Boston's relatively "metropolitan society", and so devoted to his church duties there that he did not regularly reside in Cambridge until virtually required to do so in 1700, and he commonly visited the college only a few times each month. It was arranged—probably at his suggestion—that he be created a doctor of divinity by the college so that, following European precedent, he might have the right of conferring this degree on others.

The most important section of the first part is probably that devoted to the curriculum of the second half of the seventeenth century. Seven chapters are devoted to this, and in addition there is an important appendix giving all of the colleges theses and *quaestiones* from 1643 to 1708. These chapters present the clearest picture that is anywhere available of the college curriculum of this period. Among the facts of special significance brought out are the following: that Peter Ramus had a profound influence on the educational method adopted, especially by his insistence that as far as practicable each

day should be devoted to a single subject; that the "disputation", inherited from the medieval university, played a large part in the curriculum; that the rigidly prescribed course had been lengthened from three to four years in 1652; that almost every student brought to college four books—a Bible, a Latin lexicon, an edition of Cicero, and Erasmus' *Colloquies;* that the three main elements of the course, as at Cambridge, were the medieval arts and philosophies, the study of the learned tongues, and "the lighter renaissance study of such classical belles lettres as were deemed suitable for a gentleman's education"; that even freshmen were called upon to translate the Old Testament out of Hebrew into Greek and that students "were well equipped to acquire not only a teaching but a debating knowledge of Hebrew"; that there was no trace of algebra in the curriculum until 1721; that the effective influence of the European scientists of the seventeenth century can be traced to the coming to New England in 1686 of Charles Morton, whose *Compendium Physicae* was promptly adopted as a text book, greatly broadening the knowledge of the natural world, for Harvard students in the earliest days had learned "little of the universe that Dante did not know"; and that nothing approaching a laboratory is to be found in this period, although President Hoar advocated the establishment of one. His proposal appears in a letter to Robert Boyle in 1672. He advocated "a large well-sheltered garden and orchard for students addicted to planting; an ergasterium for mechanick fancies; and a laboratory chemical . . . for readings or notions only are but husky provender" (p. 645; *cf.* pp. 400, 401). Professor Morison calls attention to this interesting plan, which, unfortunately, "came to naught", as otherwise, he says, it "would have given Harvard the earliest university chemical laboratory in the English empire, if not in the world". This may be true if a laboratory officially conducted by a university is meant, but there were several earlier ones conducted in university or college buildings by university professors, for instance that of Sir Isaac Newton at Trinity College, Cambridge (1667 or earlier), and (the earliest I have found on the Continent) that of Francesco Malocchi, at the University of Pisa about 1600 (see Savi, *Notizie per servire alla Storia del Giardino e Museo della I.e.R. Università ai Pisa,* pp. 11, 17). The first strictly university laboratory seems to have been that established at the University of Altdorf, near Nuremberg in 1682 (Klee, *Die Geschichte der Physik an der Universität Altdorf,* p. 5).

Chapter XVII brings together all that is known about the Indian College. The building which bore this name was due to the interest of the "Society for Propagation of the Gospel in New England", incorporated by Parliament in 1649. This society had become specially interested in the New England Indians because of John Eliot. The building was apparently completed in 1655, but although it had accommodation for some twenty scholars Professor Morison is able to find the names of only five aborigines who entered Harvard in the seventeenth century. Furthermore, Caleb Cheeshahteaumuck,

who took his bachelor's degree in 1665, was the only one who graduated, and he died of tuberculosis the following winter! The building was consequently used for other students and for the first printing press in North America. This resulted in the most important Indian connection with Harvard, as the entire Indian Bible—one of the rarest and most sought after of Americana—was finished there in 1663. Professor Morison shows that during the years from 1655 to 1672 about one hundred books and pamphlets were issued from the Indian College presses, of which about fifteen were in the Indian and eighty-five in the English language. The Indian College will be forever famous for providing a home for our first printing press, but the attempt to give the classical education of the seventeenth century to Indian students was a failure.

On all controversial points, such, for instance, as the reasons for Leonard Hoar's failure as president, Professor Morison is not only extremely fair, but his arguments seem convincing, unless perhaps in the difficult matter of the early ranking of students. He has already shown in his article on "Precedence at Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century" in the *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society that Professor Franklin B. Dexter's thesis in a previous number of the same *Proceedings* that the early ranking in Harvard and Yale lists was based mainly on social status, was an error, at least as far as Harvard was concerned. In the volume before us he develops this thesis further and decides that "intellectual merit" was "the determining factor in seniority at Harvard, both in the seventeenth century and well into the eighteenth" (p. 63). The reasons given for this conclusion are weighty, but he acknowledges that towards the end of the seventeenth century piety, scholarship, and social status were all factors in determining seniority (p. 452) and that in the eighteenth century ranking by intellectual merit gave way at Harvard to ranking freshmen "by 'the Degrees of their ancestors' " (p. 64). As far as the seventeenth century is concerned the matter still seems somewhat uncertain. At any rate it is striking that distinguished families, such as the Chauncys, Cottons, Dudleys, Mathers, and Winthrops enjoyed high ranking in the college lists. Professor Morison thinks that this was due mainly to the fact that they came from stock of "energy and ability" rather than because of their social status (p. 64).

The statistics of students are most interesting. The author shows that of the 360 students from 1673 to 1707 fifty-two came from the Connecticut Colony and the Connecticut Valley—indicating one of the major reasons for the founding of Yale at the close of this period—eight from New Hampshire, seventeen from the Plymouth Colony, one from Rhode Island, and all the remainder from Massachusetts Bay—about half from Boston and its neighboring towns of Roxbury and Cambridge. He also shows that the median age at which students entered the freshman class during this period was under sixteen years, and that there were several cases of students entering

at twelve or younger. In this respect, however, Harvard did not differ to any considerable extent from the English universities of the period. Sixty-four per cent of the students came from the gentry and propertied classes, and about one quarter were sons of alumni, mostly ministers.

There is no portion of this volume of more interest than the composite picture of the average graduate among the 291 alive in 1700. He is a pastor in a farming community about twenty-five miles from Boston and has taught school. He has married a girl of eighteen, "who has borne him three children, and expects to produce another every eighteen months or two years". He dresses in homespun made by his wife, except on Sundays and at funerals, when "he sports a black broadcloth suit made for his ordination by a Boston tailor, and expected to last a lifetime". He wears a wig, receives an annual salary of eighty pounds—one half in country pay—with wood and a parsonage, does a little farming with the aid of a Negro slave, keeps one horse with a saddle for himself and a pinion for his wife, but no carriage, and employs no indoor servant. "He knows by name every man, woman, and child and most of the dogs in his parish of several hundred souls". He looks after most of the medical treatment and simple legal work of the community and preaches twice every Sunday. His library consists of about two hundred volumes of which the Horace and Ovid have been "worn almost threadbare with repeated readings". "He has dropped preaching on the fine points of theology and prefers practical discourses on the divine attributes and human conduct." Indeed, in his desire to explain away some of the rigors of Calvinist theology, he has even, according to Professor Morison, become "friendly towards the Church of England"—a statement which raises some doubts. His annual journey on horseback to Cambridge is his "unique vacation". His loyalties are first to God, second to King William, and third, to New England (pp. 562, 564, 565). This is a mere summary of an extremely interesting picture.

Professor Morison's book, like its predecessor, is admirably illustrated from old prints, maps, title pages, etc.

*Washington Cathedral.* ANSON PHELPS STOKES.

*Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774–1789.* Edited from the Original Records in the Library of Congress by ROSCOE R. HILL. Volumes XXXII, XXXIII, *January 17–December 19, 1787.* (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1936. Pp. x, 384; 385-789. $2.25 each.)

IN the life of the Continental Congress the year 1787 may be characterized as one of low blood pressure and asthmatic breathing—to say nothing of the general debilitation of the body politic. Most members of Congress and nearly all others were convinced that the end of its career was close at hand unless some hitherto undetermined specific could be found for its ailments. The political chemists were busily engaged in searching for such a specific,

and while they searched, Congress occupied itself in great part in the unprofitable exercise of marking time, anxiously waiting the while to discover whether the Federal Convention would prove to be a saver of life unto life or a promoter of death unto death.

Yet the Congress did not wholly spend its time in idleness; nor did it at any time comfort itself with a philosophy of *dolce far niente*. When it could gather a working crew it worked, though unfortunately the assembling of even the minimum crew of seven represented states was sporadic, spasmodic, undependable. All things considered, the Old Congress gave a better account of itself in this trying period than might have been expected.

For one thing, it formulated and adopted the Ordinance for the Government of the Territory Northwest of the River Ohio; and if it had done nothing else, that one accomplishment would have given it immortality among the creators of governmental institutions. But it did many other useful things. For instance, it made further improvements in its method of disposing of the public lands, and it actually disposed of large tracts of those lands in a manner that gave strength and character to the nation for generations to come. An essential part of the plan for the settlement of the western country was the adjustment of relations with the Indian tribes, and Congress was much occupied with these adjustments. It also did a pretty good job of bettering the system of mails and post roads and even made a commendable effort to establish a national coinage. In the matter of foreign relations, while some of the most acute problems, as for instance those with Great Britain and Spain, remained unsolved, Congress did, when it was possible, apply itself assiduously to the task of solution. In the domain of national finances, if it saved itself from drowning, it was without assistance from the thirteen constituent states, who stood negligently by, watching the struggling and the strangling. And it is not to be forgotten that Congress did not allow the states to escape without a good round scolding for their indifference.

In late September the Federal Convention offered its plan for a national government. Some members of Congress were disposed to quarrel with the Convention for proposing what was essentially a new plan instead of merely repairing the old one; yet before long they all hushed their scoffing and turned to praise.

As for the materials that go to make up the *Journals* as here printed, the journal proper, just as in the two preceding years, is relatively scanty, while reports and other communications bulk large. In the matter of editing the volumes Dr. Hill is to be commended for two practices: the one device is that of giving to every document a heading that serves to characterize it; the other is a series of footnote citations that enable a reader to pursue a given measure or report through its several appearances before Congress. As in earlier volumes of the *Journals*, Madison's Notes of Debates (February 19 to April 26) are appended, as are also two secretarial lists of reports.

*Carnegie Institution of Washington.* EDMUND C. BURNETT.

*Washington and his Aides-de-Camp.* By EMILY STONE WHITELEY. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. 217. $2.50.)

*George Washington and the West.* By CHARLES H. AMBLER, Professor of History, West Virginia University. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1936. Pp. vii, 270. $4.00.)

MRS. Whiteley has written a pleasant little book, gossipy, cheerful, and entertaining, with just enough history in it to pretend to an authority it does not really possess. A thorough grasp of the fundamentals of the Revolutionary movement might perhaps have pulled it together in a way that would have given it masculine substance. Its bright colors are somewhat muddied by describing the New England volunteer army as "a shining sword, ready to hand" which Congress grasped. The general impression is that Congress' fingers were reluctantly pulled and pressed around a weak and tinny weapon. France's distrust of Congress, the reason for which is the core of the American Revolution, is an important subject, yet it is dismissed by Mrs. Whiteley with a light surmise that seriously affects the worth of her other and more correct appraisals. It is inexcusable to say that "on several occasions these boys [the aides] were empowered to decide on a plan of campaign with the allied French officers" (p. 7). Perhaps the author's femininity handicaps her understanding of military strategy; but to say the British "broke" through a gap in the American line at Long Island is at variance with fact. The matter was so completely a surprise that Sullivan did not know what had happened until the British were behind his line.

Nevertheless the character sketches of the aides are pleasant little appraisals, surprisingly correct and satisfying. Alexander Hamilton is given much more attention throughout the book than any other aide, and the thumbnail limning of him on page 48 is an exceptionally clever bit of truth. The Conway Cabal is very lightly touched upon, too lightly in view of its importance in the entire Revolutionary movement; and it is unfortunate that George Washington Parke Custis's florid imagination should be allowed to daub once again the unquestioned bravery of David Cobb. The Varick copying of Washington's letters is properly mentioned; but much more could have been told of this stupendous piece of clerical labor. There were six copists instead of two, as mentioned, and the demon rum accounted for one dismissal. The continuity of the life at headquarters is disregarded to no purpose; but there is more meat in the book than the index points out. The author calls her book a footnote to history. It is more than that, and though it mixes substantial history with some not so substantial, the result is something of which Mrs. Whiteley need not be ashamed.

Professor Ambler tell us that his book is for the most part based upon printed sources. His comprehensive bibliography is an evidence of his assiduity, but in citations from printed works little critical distinction seems to have been made between documentary texts and mere historical opinions:

Rupert Hughes, Paul Leicester Ford, and Henry Cabot Lodge being accorded equal weight with the Dinwiddie Papers, the Journals of the House of Burgesses, and Washington's Writings. This neutralizes the author's conclusions and is a contributing factor to the uninspiring and somewhat heavy character of the work. A disproportionate amount of biographical detail and military history, which has slight value to the purpose of the book, may be due to the spell which often handicaps those who write about Washington. The Jumonville incident, the Fort Necessity campaign, and Braddock's defeat are dwelt upon at considerable length, and the value, to a study of Washington and the West, of dragging in a recent Sally Fairfax theory is questionable. Statements such as that the Canadians remained loyal to Britain during the Revolution through the influence of a great number of loyalists who sought refuge in Canada (p. 164) need buttressing by authorities.

Characterization of Washington as a landgrabber and a modern real-estate promoter in one place and as the "hero" in others seems slightly inconsistent. It may be doubted, too, that the Boston Tea Party "was a godsend to Washington in many ways" because it caused the rejection of the Vandalia petition, "thus augmenting his private fortune and public influence" (pp. 150–151), for Washington had not "staked his fortune on the future of the American frontier" (p. 159). One may disagree also, without trepidation, with the conclusion that "as respects the Trans-Allegheny Washington's plans for tying it to the East by ties of interest are perhaps his greatest claims to statesmanship" (p. 208). The author's choice of words is often unhappy; "clients" is not accurately descriptive of the Virginia colonial officers who co-operated with Washington in establishing their titles to the Ohio bounty lands. The colonel was chosen at a general meeting to locate and push their claims, and though the expense was to be shared pro rata, it had to be borne largely by Washington in the end. A grave misapprehension is the statement that in the colonial period Washington's principle of religious liberty had no better foundation than a sordid hoped for profit from land exploitation.

*Washington, D. C.* J. C. Fitzpatrick.

*From 'Prentice to Patron: the Life Story of Isaiah Thomas.* By Annie Russell Marble. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1935. Pp. xii, 326. $3.00.)

Among the minor personages of the early Republic Isaiah Thomas has an honorable place by virtue of his activities as journalist and publisher and his special services to students of American history. In pre-Revolutionary journalism his *Massachusetts Spy* was significant because of its political radicalism and the adaptation of its style to a more popular constituency. It was founded in 1770, when Thomas was only twenty-one and had had a

varied and somewhat erratic career as apprentice to printers and newspaper publishers in New Hampshire, Nova Scotia, and Carolina. With the oncoming of the Revolution the *Spy* was transferred from Boston to Worcester, where it survived the war, continuing for more than a century as one of the substantial New England journals.

Besides his newspaper, Thomas published the short-lived *Royal American Magazine* (1774), the more important *Massachusetts Magazine* (1789-1796), and an almanac which by 1797 had a circulation of 29,000 copies. As printer and publisher his lists were extensive and varied—including textbooks by Noah Webster and Jedidiah Morse, the first American edition of *Mother Goose's Melody,* many other "juveniles", music books, and an early American edition of Blackstone's *Commentaries.* His later interests were more definitely historical, and his *History of Printing in America* (1810), though not infallible, is indispensable for the student of eighteenth century journalism. Last, but certainly not least, of his contributions was his initiative in the founding of the American Antiquarian Society, which has built up about his own substantial gifts an outstanding collection of Americana.

The late Mrs. Marble, the author of this first extended biography of Thomas, drew largely on the autobiographical material in the *History of Printing;* to the revised edition of that work (1874) was prefixed a "Memoir" of Thomas by his grandson. Mrs. Marble also profited by the researches of the late Dr. Charles L. Nichols, and her own gleanings added further details. Careful revision would have eliminated some slips. "Acting Governor" Tryon (pp. 34, 35) held, when Thomas knew him, a regular governor's commission. "Breckenridge" (p. 88) should be Brackenridge. The Encyclopedist Diderot appears as "Didot" in a quotation from an English translation of Brissot de Warville's *Nouveaux Voyages* (p. 202); in the index he is "Didot, printer". In discussing the literary shortcomings of Thomas's contemporaries (pp. 287–288) too much seems to be made of "the universal training in classical languages and the tendency of that era to imitate the English writers of the Restoration prose". Here and elsewhere the diction might be improved. Thomas's bookbindery is said to have "exampled finished qualities of the printing art and durability" (p. 165), and we are told that a certain letter "was chronicle of another link in the chain of associations" (p. 231).

The book gives a fair picture of an active-minded, normally acquisitive, but genuinely public-spirited Yankee. As a piece of historical biography its perspective would have profited by the omission of some, not always relevant, details. On the other hand, if the writer had been more at home in the general history of the period, she might have provided a better setting for her hero's career and achievements.

*Columbia University.* EVARTS B. GREENE.

*Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist: Selected Writings.* Edited by HERBERT ANTHONY KELLAR, Director, McCormick Historical Association. Volume I, *1825–1845*. [Indiana Historical Collections.] (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau. 1936. Pp. xxv, 582. $2.00.)

SOLON Robinson was one of that group of agricultural publicists of the nineteenth century who deserve to be better known. In this excellent volume Mr. Kellar has combined a selection of Robinson's writings covering principally the decade ending in 1845 with a well-written thirty-nine page biography, which supplies a background for the material to follow. This Connecticut Yankee came to northwestern Indiana in 1834. He developed a farm from the raw prairie, became active in behalf of the squatters, and early began to travel and write for the agricultural press. So widely and so favorably did he becomes known that he was called east, where in 1853 he became the agricultural editor of Horace Greeley's New York *Tribune*.

The present volume contains selections comprising some one third of his writings during the period 1825–1845, nearly all of which appeared in agricultural papers, particularly the Albany *Cultivator*, and in newspapers. This is the first time, however, that these articles have been assembled and edited. The range of Robinson's interest was remarkable. For examples, one might select the following: "Description of Northwestern Indiana"; "Organization of the Squatters' Union, and Constitution"; "'So much for' Berkshires"; "American Society of Agriculture"; "Plan of a Farm House"; "Sheep on the Prairies"; "Fence or No Fence?"; "Notes of Travel in the Southwest"; and "A Mississippi Plantation". He describes prairie breaking, speaks of fattening hogs on mast, pictures an immigrant camp in central Illinois and advises bringing implements and seeds rather than pianos, tells of importing Berkshire hogs, writes a story of western life and intrigue, states the cost of sheep in the West, gives an account of the log houses of the planters in Mississippi, comments on slavery, and occasionally refers to politics. He appears to have known but little of the agricultural chemistry of Liebig, Johnston, and others, and paid very little attention to such matters. Likewise his comments on agricultural machinery are all too brief. But whether at home or on the many pilgrimages over the country, by which he made himself one of the best informed men of his day on agricultural conditions, he described farming as he saw it and advocated more careful cultivation, better homes, improved livestock, and agricultural education through schools, agricultural societies and farm papers.

The selection of the material has been judicious, and the editing is at the same time adequate and merciful. Robinson customarily named persons and places, and Mr. Kellar has been particularly diligent and successful in identifying each, so making the footnotes a veritable "Who's Who" of persons interested in agriculture in the forties. No bibliography, other than that contained in the footnotes, is included in this volume, but a combined

bibliography will be incorporated in the second volume, which will cover the period from 1846 to 1851 inclusive, when Robinson left Indiana. This volume is a credit to the author-editor and the Indiana Historical Bureau and is a real service to economic and social history.

*Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago.* RUSSELL H. ANDERSON.

*The Life of Washington Irving.* By STANLEY T. WILLIAMS, Professor of English in Yale University. Two volumes. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. xxi, 501; viii, 445. $15.00.)

*A Bibliography of the Writings of Washington Irving: a Check List.* Compiled by STANLEY T. WILLIAMS and MARY ALLEN EDGE. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. xix, 200. $10.00.)

No more intensive research into the life and works of an American author has ever been made. The thoroughness of ten years of study is attested not only by the body of these volumes but perhaps even more forcibly by the literally thousands upon thousands of accompanying notes. In achieving his *Life of Washington Irving* Stanley Williams has raised a standard of scholarship which can hardly be surpassed.

Until recent years biographers of our first man of letters to receive European recognition followed the sentimental and sometimes misleading guidance of Pierre M. Irving, his uncle's earliest biographer. Professor Williams has availed himself of the research of less prejudiced students in the Irving field but has gone far beyond them in the breadth of his readings and the successful laboriousness of his detections. From all over the world he has ferreted out immediate and cognate data. His trained historical sense provides the background for Irving's activities, both in America and in those various European countries where Irving spent a third of his long life. The literary acumen of Stanley Williams makes for a reasoned judgment of Irving's literary accomplishment. If here we find no startling new evaluation—if Irving remains a great figure in the history of American literature but not a great author *per se*—it is with discrimination and added emphasis that Professor Williams posits his opinions concerning Irving's contemporary fame and its later decline.

The book is written by a scholar, not by a stylist, though the style is entirely adequate. Written by a scholar, the book makes no concession to the semi-fictional approach of many modern biographies. Standing on the firm ground of ascertained fact and of logical deduction and conclusion, Professor Williams presents Washington Irving as an author, a diplomat, a historian, and as a personality. The canvas is enormous, but both in its salient aspects and its details, a cyclorama of much interest, much color, faithful drawing. Great personages enter into the scene, but no faked conversations are imagined, no false romance introduced, to lure the reader. A true biography.

We remain, however, a little perplexed by Professor Williams's refusal to accept as an established fact Irving's proposal of marriage to Emily Foster. In order to keep up the tradition of Irving's lifelong bachelorhood because of his early love for Matilda Hoffman, Pierre Irving deleted passages in Irving's Dresden notebooks. But not always quite deleted. A few faint pencilings, still decipherable, indicate, with their contiguous notations, the very day of Irving's offer. Even more convincing are the definite statements in the diary of Emily's sister; and there is much further corroborative evidence. Professor Williams does, indeed, admit the probability of the proposal, but it is to be regretted that he does not accept the fact which is in our opinion necessary to the understanding of subsequent events in Irving's life. If Mr. Williams had propounded the theory that in proposing to Emily, Irving was still in love with Matilda, saw Matilda in Emily, and was refused by Emily partially because the dead girl still held first place in her suitor's affections, we should have had a sentimental and yet still plausible approach. But to leave the offer itself in question is unnecessarily to doubt the veracity of Flora Foster and to leave the biography indefinite on a very important point.

Apart from this, there can be nothing but praise for Mr. Williams's book; nothing but praise, also, for the excellent bibliography in whose compilation he was aided by Mary Allen Edge. Mr. Williams assumed a colossal task in becoming not only the biographer of one man but also the historian of more than three fourths of a century of American and European life. A better historian, indeed, than Irving himself, and a more thorough biographer. For he shows how our first man of letters, for all the grace of his writings, the humor, the engaging sentimentality, was only—pre-eminently in some of his works relating to Spain—seldom the assiduous scholar making original research, and more often, as in the *Life of Washington,* predominantly dependent on the labors and the productions of previous authors. Mr. Williams, with equal accuracy, makes again evident the important part played by Irving as the first prominent American to gain for his country the good will of Europe. He shows in new detail how the lovableness of Irving was valuable for America in diplomacy. As first secretary of our legation in London, as minister at Madrid, the author of *Bracebridge Hall* and of *Columbus* proved himself efficient in the conduct of international affairs. State correspondence little known, documents long forgotten, are, in this connection, drawn upon by Mr. Williams in his authoritative presentation. All of us who have studied and written in the Irving field should take off our hats to the fine scholar of whom Yale University must indeed be proud.

*New York City.* GEORGE S. HELLMAN.

***The Older Middle West, 1840-1880: its Social, Economic, and Political Life and Sectional Tendencies before, during, and after the Civil War.*** **By** HENRY CLYDE HUBBART, Professor of History, Ohio Wesleyan University.

[The American Historical Association.] (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1936. Pp. ix, 305. $3.00.)

THE American Historical Association need have no qualms about sponsoring the publication of this thought-provoking monograph, for Professor Hubbart has done a real service in rescuing the history of the Middle West during the middle period from the hands of the antiquarians. The significance of strictly frontier history, following Professor Turner's lead, has long been abundantly recognized, and capable historians have spared no pains in writing it. But the subsequent period—the presumably drab years that followed when the frontier had moved farther into the West—this period has all too frequently been left to the loving-kindness of aged writers of reminiscences. Professor Turner in his later historical works, particularly in his essays on sectionalism, recorded clearly his belief that the post-frontier period was well worth the same careful scrutiny that had been given to the frontier period itself. The book under review furnishes conclusive evidence of the validity of this opinion. It is to be hoped that many such sectional studies will be made.

As Professor Hubbart points out, "the people of the free West in the forties and fifties were a political people". On this score he is perhaps justified in devoting the majority of his pages to politics. The "turbulent, youthful, rampant democracy" of the Jacksonian era, however, possessed a unity of party and purpose that was not destined to endure, for the slavery issue soon split the Middle West asunder. Its upper counties, the lakes region, tended to throw in their lot with the Republican party, while its lower counties, the older settled portion along the Ohio, remained Democratic. Skillfully the author introduces Stephen A. Douglas as the western insurgent who, even at the cost of a break with the eastern and southern leaders of his party, sought to formulate out of western experience a platform upon which first the entire free West, and perhaps ultimately the nation itself, might unite. And, as Professor Hubbart sees it, the differences between the views of the western Republicans under Lincoln's leadership and the western Democrats under Douglas's leadership had narrowed down before 1860 to virtual insignificance. Southerners rightly feared and suspected one faction about as much as the other.

Douglas failed, perhaps unfortunately, to persuade either his section or the nation that the Union could permanently endure without a considerable degree of "uniformity in local laws and domestic institutions", but he did succeed in keeping alive the interest of the West in the West. "What we have called 'Copperheadism' ", Professor Hubbart argues, "appears to be the manner in which thwarted westerners showed their sectional discontent; it was not primarily pro-southern in sympathy. Jacksonian democracy, so vigorous and powerful in earlier decades, was not, as our histories imply, crushed out between an aggressive industrial North and a slave-holding South, but

persisted in the Middle West and made great contributions to our national life."

The book is by no means strictly political, although the political theme predominates. Four excellent chapters, "Society in the Lower West", "Middle Western Culture", "Trade with the South", and "The Gilded Age in the West", are almost wholly devoted to nonpolitical subjects. The one conspicuous omission that impresses the reviewer is the failure to deal extensively with the one subject that meant more to the free West than politics—agriculture. This word does not so much as appear in the index, and the sole reference to Cyrus McCormick concerns his ownership of the Chicago *Times*. There are, to be sure, ample statistics on the production of wheat and corn, and an abundance of evidence on the significant subject of marketing. But one looks in vain for an account of the startling changes that occurred in agricultural methods between the years 1840 and 1880—the agricultural revolution—and the result of these changes on the farmers' business methods and points of view. The answer to this criticism is, of course, that the author has simply not set himself that task. He leaves the field still open for someone to weave into the political, social, and economic history of the Middle West the story of its evolution from subsistence farming to capitalistic agriculture.

*The University of Wisconsin.* JOHN D. HICKS.

*Der amerikanische Staatsmann, John C. Calhoun, ein Kämpfer gegen die "Ideen von 1789": Studien zur Vorgeschichte des amerikanischen Bürgerkrieges.* Von Dr. Dietrich Zwicker. [Historische Studien.] (Berlin: Emil Ebering. 1935. Pp. 235. 8 M.)

ACCORDING to the author of this learned volume, the entrance of the United States into the World War was to most Germans entirely unexpected. That fact, he says, is enough to show how slight was the knowledge of the American problem, and it produced a new interest in American history. What was first needed, in the author's opinion, was a study of the cultural relations between America and Germany. This volume is the result—the first attempt to evaluate Calhoun from the German viewpoint, with the exception, the author says, of an old volume by E. G. Elliott. It is noteworthy that in this connection he omits Von Holst, who of course did not discuss the reaction of American history upon Europe but from the beginning was certainly a German historian; and in fact it is difficult to understand his writings without some appreciation of the atmosphere in which he began and carried on a large part of his work.

The first portion of the volume gives a sketch of American history during the decades before Calhoun entered upon the scene as an effective leader. Most of this will not particularly interest the American reader. There are a few rather unnecessary blunders, which probably will do no special damage

to the German reader—for example, the statement that Jefferson was the author of the Virginia resolutions of 1798 and Madison the author of the Kentucky resolutions. The assertion that both of these men declared that the Constitution rested upon *Vertrag* and that the central government and the states stood as *gleichberechtigte Vertragspartner nebeneinander* raises of course the question of how *Vertrag* is to be translated. No distinction between compact and treaty is suggested. The narrative story of Calhoun's life is sufficiently orthodox, though there are opportunities for differences of opinion concerning the extent and character of certain influences which, in the author's opinion, affected Calhoun's career and character as a statesman.

The main theme of the volume is ably treated. The subtitle, it will be noticed, calls Calhoun a militant opponent of the ideas or doctrines of 1789; in other words, he rejected and resented the doctrines of the French Revolution and denied the equality of men. In the discussion of this topic the Declaration of Independence and the doctrines put forth in France are considered to be of identical import. This method of treatment is, in the reviewer's judgment, unfortunate. But, again, this is not a matter of tragic importance; for certainly Calhoun openly and eloquently announced the inequality of men, and this announcement is the thing to which the author pays special attention. Of considerable interest to us is the discussion of the possible source of Calhoun's proslavery philosophy, and this portion of the book is especially well done. Considerable space is given to an examination of the validity of certain suggestions made by learned American historians concerning the influence of Dew and Lieber, who may have learned their social philosophy in German universities. The author declares Dew's residence in Germany is entirely devoid of significance for his writings. And for Lieber history was, as for Hegel, a development, a movement toward freedom. To make matters worse—or better—the doctrines of Dew and Calhoun rest not on German but on English authority and, above all, on Burke, the great influential opponent of French theories: "Jene Lehre von der Ungleichheit der Menschen übernahm Dew von keinem anderen als Edmund Burke." A somewhat similar statement is made concerning the influence of Burke upon Calhoun.

Of course the South was not completely cut off from the currents of European thought; and the author discusses in an entertaining way not only the character of German conservatism but also the apparent influence of historical realism which inevitably led to the rejection of an artificial and imaginary state of nature in which all men were free and equal. Proslavery writers and orators could quote history and rely upon it as proving natural inequality; they could refer to a law of nature which manifested itself through actual agelong activities of men. And still I find no difficulty in believing that the proslavery doctrine was practically autochthonous. Why should not an intelligent slaveholder develop a philosophy to support slavery rather

than import his ideas from abroad? This question is not intended to imply a rejection of the influence of scientific historical writing, which sought to expose the *eigentlich gewesen*.

When Doctor Zwicker declares that "Calhouns Philosophie der 'Disquisition' ist eine Anwendung der Burkeschen Lehren auf den amerikanischen Süden", he certainly is using rather sweeping terms. Some passages in the *Disquisition* do bear a sort of family resemblance to certain pronouncements of the *Reflections*. We may acknowledge that there is nothing new under the sun, but we can scarcely deny to Calhoun the qualities of an original and originating genius. Probably—though, again, the supposition presents difficulties—he owed more to John Taylor than to any other dealer in political theories. Of course the great question to be answered is why and how he came to an appreciation of the vital character of the state—a living sentient being, possessed of self-determination, of indivisible sovereignty, of intrinsic and inescapable authority. It is true that as soon as one discards the artificialism of the old natural rights philosophy, he is on the highroad to another abstraction, which demands the recognition of the life qualities of the state. These qualities cannot be divided or distributed or, it appears, given away without self-destruction. And having started as a disciple of historical realism and a believer in the operation of vital social forces, the traveler is likely, unless he watches his step, to end with declarations which history can neither verify nor support. Now it was, of course, this doctrine of indivisible sovereignty and the impossibility of forming a body politic by agreement which connects Calhoun's name with the history of Germany and with the writings of German publicists, especially during the discussions concerning the character of the North German Confederation and of the new Empire. This fact, not unknown to American scholars, is treated by Dr. Zwicker in a helpful manner. As the whole book deals largely with intangibles, we have no right to demand demonstration. It raises questions and propounds a thesis, and if the reader cannot in all respects agree with the author's conclusions, he can at least be grateful for a stimulating discussion.

*The University of Chicago.* A. C. McLaughlin.

*The Cast-Iron Man: John C. Calhoun and American Democracy.* By Arthur Styron. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1935. Pp. vi, 426. $3.50.)

Whether attached to a man or to men, nothing equals the power of an idea which appeals to human emotions. When the idea is sponsored by an unusual intellect the result is of historical and social significance. In the first part of his political career John C. Calhoun, as a War Hawk, was active in asserting the divine right of the majority. In the years following the War of 1812, first in Monroe's Cabinet and then as vice-president, he was in

politics but not of it. During this political hiatus the changing nationwide political-economic situation produced new alignments, which Calhoun watched from his legislative isolation. New England had reversed itself and had become protariff; the West was seeking markets for its agricultural products; the South, producing cotton with cheap labor, required an export market for a raw material with which to pay for manufactured articles imported over a rising tariff wall.

The author of this book fails to explain the significance of Calhoun's period of political isolation and the effect of his thought on the situation that faced him when he emerged again into the strife of the political arena. From being an ardent nationalist he became, apparently, a narrow exponent of sectionalism. In reality he merely changed his allegiance from the majority, of which he had been a member, to the group which, due to economic changes, now found itself as a member of the minority. In this process his loyalty remained constantly attached to the group, but the group's outlook and necessities had changed.

The author gives the impression that Calhoun evolved his political philosophy on the basis of a material development that he could not, at the time, have foreseen. This is true, but it fails to show an understanding of the consistent continuity and application of Calhoun's thinking. Conditions and necessities that were transitory held his allegiance only as his group followed them; when the group or section parted company with these transitory conditions, Calhoun, constant in his loyalty, followed. His political philosophy evolved with change but was consistent in its objective—the political right of his section or group to go as it pleased, subject only to the will of the majority within the group or section. It mattered not that the group was in the minority or that it, in fact, represented an oligarchy.

There is little discussion of Calhoun's philosophy but rather constant denunciation of his opponents, both as individuals and in their various groupings. Of Calhoun the man there is little. He is treated as a symbol, but the treatment is ineffective because the author does not understand the symbol. Instead, this biography is largely made up of personal observations, many of them foreign to the subject but affording the author opportunities for literary expression of opinions and dogmas.

This is not an original estimate or interpretation. Nor does it help to an understanding of Calhoun and what he stood for and tried to do. No original source material is indicated as having been used. There is an index and a short bibliography of printed sources and works used.

*Great Neck, N. Y.* THOMAS ROBSON HAY.

*Cherokee Messenger.* By ALTHEA BASS. [Civilization of the American Indian Series.] (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1936. Pp. 348. $3.00.)

THIS latest product of the University of Oklahoma Press fully upholds

the standard set by the best of its predecessors and has claim to literary merit well above the average. It was fortunate in its subject, who is eminently worthy of such treatment as has been accorded him; for assuredly no finer type of missionary than the Reverend Samuel Austin Worcester was ever sent out by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions or, for that matter, by any board. The Cherokees, among whom he labored for the whole term of his service—nearly thirty-four years—bestowed upon him the descriptive name of "Messenger", and it is under this guise that the author has seen fit to present him to an interested world.

For his chosen work Worcester had very special qualifications, linguistic skill being the most notable of them, and very special training; so also had his wife, who was officially and actually his assistant, a true helpmeet. She was a bride when she went out with him from New England, and, for her, there was to be no returning thither. Her husband did return once. It was in 1856, when she had been in her grave sixteen years and he in exile almost thirty-one.

The years of Worcester's sojourn in the Cherokee country, east and west of the Mississippi, were troublous ones for his charges. The earlier years saw the agitation over removal and its accomplishment; the middle, the adjustment of emigrant Indians to new conditions of life in the land "of their compulsory adoption"; and the later, the beginning of the controversy over slavery. Towards all these matters, particularly removal, Worcester presented a heroic front. But his great work had to do always with the actual civilizing of the Indians. Civilization in conjunction with evangelization was his theory of endeavor. That being the case, the illustrations of the book have been fittingly selected.

It was chiefly from manuscript records of the A.B.C.F.M. that Mrs. Bass derived her knowledge, although, because of their as yet unclassified state, she did not find it feasible to cite them separately. Other sources of information are described or indicated in the acknowledgments and in footnotes. There is no bibliography. The index is full but unannotated.

*Aberdeen, Washington.* ANNIE HELOISE ABEL-HENDERSON.

*Almira Hart Lincoln Phelps: Her Life and Work.* By EMMA LYDIA BOLZAU. (Lancaster: Science Press. 1936. Pp. xi, 534. $3.50.)

THIS carefully prepared volume, with its thirty six pages of bibliography and its useful index, presents in considerable detail the work done as teacher and writer by Mrs. Almira Hart Lincoln Phelps, a sister of the better known Emma Willard. The thirteen chapters contain much information of interest to students of education. From 1824 to 1856 Mrs. Phelps was actively concerned with bettering the methods of teaching in schools for young women. She was not, like Emma Willard, a pioneer among educational reformers, but as an organizer and a popular writer she gave an impetus to improve-

ments initiated by others. In her sister's school at Troy she developed methods of teaching science that made botany and chemistry attractive subjects to the students. Not finding a suitable textbook for use in her classes, she prepared a brief work in 1829 called *Familiar Lectures on Botany*. This book, which passed through many editions over a period of forty-three years, and later textbooks in natural philosophy and chemistry made the name of Mrs. Phelps well known in her own time. At Troy also she first put into writing her ideas on female education, and through her efforts a course in pedagogy was given in the seminary. At West Chester Young Ladies' Seminary, Rahway Female Institute, and Patapsco Female Institute Mrs. Phelps endeavored to carry out the new ideals of educational leaders. As principal of these schools she encouraged the study of science, stressed physical education, and promoted vocational training for teachers.

Miss Bolzau, in presenting the career of Mrs. Phelps from her school days to her active old age, has not been interested chiefly in rescuing a forgotten woman from oblivion. She has been concerned rather with the textbooks which Mrs. Phelps wrote, the schools in which she served, the methods of instruction introduced, and the changing conceptions of woman's sphere. One chapter is devoted to an account of the seminaries at West Chester and Rahway; another, to an elaborate history of Patapsco Female Institute—its founding, course of study, social life, examinations, and school journal. A particularly valuable chapter deals with early textbooks in science. In considering the contributions to this field, Miss Bolzau analyzes several of Mrs. Phelps's more popular works and shows that although the writer culled her facts from the authorities of the day, her books, with their pleasing style and strongly moral emphasis, did much to promote the teaching of science. Any reader interested in the subject of the education of women will find many valuable details in this volume.

*Wellesley College.* BERTHA MONICA STEARNS.

*Theodore Parker.* By HENRY STEELE COMMAGER. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1936. Pp. ix, 339. $3.00.)

PROFESSOR Commager disclaims any theory of biography yet proceeds on what must certainly be counted a theory—that he will try "to see men and events with Parker's eyes, to react to the events of the time as he did, or as I think that he did". Whatever virtue this may have as a theory, it is here shown to be virtually impossible in practice, at least under the biographical method which Professor Commager has pursued, and with admirable results. In spite of the preliminary declaration that this "is Parker's book, made up of the writings, the letters, the recorded conversations of Parker and his contemporaries", it must be recognized that the author has resorted rather to brief significant quotations which are taken as starting points for restatement and interpretation. Had more dates of orientation been attached to these

starting points, the result would have been more satisfying, yet it is so suggestive and informing that one may well be thankful for it. One may nevertheless remain skeptical of its value as illustrating either the absence or the existence of a theory.

It was time for a new life of Theodore Parker. His more respectable contemporaries could hardly have been expected to do him justice, but it is hard to see why a later competent student of the abolition period has not until now dealt in our own period with this exciting subject. Professor Commager's book does more than merely that, for it presents a spirited picture of the Boston which for some thirty years before the Civil War was kept by the antislavery agitators, overlapping with the "come-outers" of so many other varieties, in a constant state of agitation. There is probably no city in the United States more heavily documented than Boston with the materials for such a study as this—biographies, memoirs, letters, reminiscences, and a teeming newspaper press. The manuscript resources of the Boston Public Library and the Massachusetts Historical Society were obviously of service to Professor Commager, but much of his work could have been done without visiting Boston at all.

The merits and the weaknesses of the place are equally open to inspection. In a chapter on "Slavery and the Higher Law" Professor Commager alludes to "the singular infamy that Boston could boast" and ends his catalogue of conservative manifestations thus: "Richard Dana espoused abolition and lost his clients; Doctor Bowditch walked arm in arm with Frederick Douglass and lost his patients; Charles Sumner denounced Webster and lost his friends. Well might James Freeman Clarke say, 'When I came to Boston, it was harder to speak of slavery than it had been in Kentucky.' Well might Garrison write that here he had found 'contempt more bitter, opposition more active, detraction more relentless, prejudice more stubborn, and apathy more frozen than among the slave owners themselves.' "

The native vigor, the encyclopedic learning, the hard-hitting eloquence of Theodore Parker all went into the trumpet blasts which he directed against the walls of an assaulted Jericho. In helping to break them down he broke his own strength and came to an invalid's untimely end. On the back cover of this biography—and one cannot help wondering why not on the title page—Parker receives the designation of "Yankee Crusader". It fits him well, and all the promise of the term is fulfilled in the book itself, which should take a permanent place as a valuable and provocative study of an important figure and period in the history of New England.

*The Boston Athenæum.* M. A. DeWolfe Howe.

*Life of Robert M. T. Hunter: a Study in Sectionalism and Secession.* By Henry Harrison Simms, Assistant Professor of History, Ohio State University. (Richmond: William Byrd Press. 1935. Pp. 234. $3.00.)

It would be hard to say what the country now thinks, seventy-five years after the upheaval, of the men who led the South into secession. They are often referred to as "fire-eaters", their policy looked upon as perverse.

As one of the leaders of this group, Robert Mercer Taliaferro Hunter furnishes an interesting subject for a biography. Yet there was nothing of the firebrand in his nature. He was, on the contrary, mild mannered and conciliatory, contemplative and deliberate. Not only does his public and private life appear to have been above reproach, but his political policy seems to have been based upon the highest motives. To say this of a man who opposed the admission of California as a free state, objected to the Compromise of 1850, and was a leading advocate in the cause of slavery and secession is, to say the least, rather unusual. It is generally assumed that these were unworthy causes and that those who championed them were necessarily less meritorious than those who took the other side.

Professor Simms gives just enough of the other side to raise some question as to the correctness of this assumption. He points out that the Free Soilers were, in many cases, distinctly hostile to the Negro and gives good evidence to the effect that race prejudice was as strong in the free as in the slave states. He maintains that nullification of the fugitive slave laws by Northern states was not legally different from nullification in South Carolina, and he shows that in 1859 Wisconsin adopted the most advanced stand on the question of state sovereignty, her legislature resolving that "positive defiance" was the proper remedy for encroachments by the federal government.

Hunter was a consistent defender of the doctrine of state rights and was not able to sacrifice principle to expediency. He honestly believed that the fundamental purpose of the tirade against slavery was to gain political power and exercise it for economic ends. His public policy was dictated by these considerations. Could he have looked forward to this day, perhaps he might have found solace in the spectacle of the party which made war upon the defenders of state rights now inveighing against the usurpation of power by the federal government. The Virginian, who was for thirty years a power in politics, spent his last days operating a country grist mill, and his name, once known throughout the land, has been all but forgotten.

Jefferson Davis and Robert Toombs, the other two members of the "Southern Trio" who so largely assumed direction of Southern affairs, have not been overlooked; but Professor Simms's careful and dispassionate study is the first biography of the third member, and it meets adequately a long-felt need.

*The University of Virginia.* Thomas Perkins Abernethy.

*James Longstreet, Lee's War Horse.* By H. J. Eckenrode, Historian of the Virginia Conservation and Development Commission, and Bryan

CONRAD, Assistant Historian of the Virginia Conservation and Development Commission, Colonel in the U. S. Army. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1936. Pp. viii, 399. $3.50.)

OF the writing of books on the events and personalities of the War between the States there is no end. Some are good, some are bad, and others are both good and bad. The book under consideration belongs in the last named category. The authors have chosen three phases of General Longstreet's career on which to build their account: the aggressive use by Longstreet of his "physical bigness" as a means of overcoming personal opposition; Lee's alleged subserviency to Longstreet; and Longstreet's ardent desire for independent command and his failure after he attained it. Many dogmatic statements are made without citation. In the process Longstreet appears more as a querulous, faultfinding subordinate than as the splendid fighter and leader that he was.

Longstreet was a big, vital man, who began to try to direct army movements and strategy at the First Bull Run and continued in this effort to Appomattox. As a result, he was constantly in collision with associates and superiors. With Lee these tactics only seemed to work. He listened and used his own judgment; Bragg listened and got mad; Johnston listened and was apt to become confused.

The authors' attitude toward Lee is little short of patronizing. Poor fellow, he could not command Longstreet, the forceful man of "steel nerves"; always he "should" have done this or that, usually as suggested by Longstreet. Throughout, the authors seem obsessed with Longstreet's influence over Lee. As a result, a distorted, misleading account is given of their relations and of the tactics and strategy of the campaigns in Virginia and Tennessee. However, as was once said by a distinguished soldier, "that any question involving mental process and intelligence should have been hidden from Lee, and patent to Longstreet, is a startling proposition to any who have a knowledge of the two men".

The desire for independent command was a siren that continually beckoned Longstreet; he was not satisfied until he got an opportunity. This came first in the spring of 1863, when he was sent to southern Virginia. The only result was muddle, a jeopardizing of the safety of Lee's army, and Longstreet's own discomfiture. In the fall of the year he was sent to Tennessee to re-enforce Bragg. A fruitless, hard won victory, bitter dissension, and ultimate failure were the outcome. These two experiences convinced Longstreet that he was not fitted for independent command. But they did not put an end to his carping criticism of all and sundry. He respected Jackson's ability but thought him queer and uncertain; he had scant respect for President Davis and none at all for Bragg. More than once he tried to shift the responsibility for his own failure to others less able or responsible.

This account of Longstreet is the most sweeping indictment of the man and his methods yet published. He is characterized as an officer of "over-

weening ambition, extreme self-confidence and willfulness, strangely balanced by lack of aggressiveness". The impression is given that to his ambition Longstreet was willing to sacrifice Lee, his superior, any Confederate army he did not control, nay even the Confederacy itself. The presentation is neither fair to Longstreet nor to the cause he served.

The authors state that Longstreet's book—*Manassas to Appomattox*—"can be accepted only with the greatest caution", yet they cite it constantly without comment. Only a few secondary sources appear to have been consulted. An occasional reference is also made to the *Official Records*. There are several good maps and an index, but no bibliography.

Many secondary Confederate leaders still await critical study and evaluation. It is to be hoped that any who undertake these studies will devote more of time and careful research to their task than the authors of this biography of General Longstreet appear to have done.

*Great Neck, N. Y.* THOMAS ROBSON HAY.

*Canada and the British Army, 1846-1871: a Study in the Practice of Responsible Government.* By C. P. STACEY, Instructor in History, Princeton University. [Royal Empire Society Imperial Studies.] (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1936. Pp. xi, 287. $4.20.)

THIS study, a doctoral dissertation at Princeton, takes up for detailed examination a special phase of the development of Canadian nationality—the relations of the province, and later of the Dominion, to the mother country in the matter of defense. The writer takes as the theme of the discussion a remark of Disraeli in 1866: "An army maintained in a country which does not permit us even to govern it! What an anomaly!". This formulated the problem of a divided responsibility, not only in Canada but elsewhere. On his first page the writer points this out in a manner singularly striking to readers south of the boundary line, saying, "The greatest tragedy of British imperial history—the loss of the old American colonies—was the outcome of an inept attempt at solving this problem."

The early history of the military system was fundamentally the same in both groups of colonies. England was in theory responsible for protection against foreign attack; defense against Indian raids and other local difficulties were the affair of the colonies themselves. Hence a dual system—British regulars and colonial militia—on both sides of the line. The problem is still with us in the United States, the problem of the relations of the regular army and the state forces. We have found this difficult enough of solution in a completely federated government; we found it insoluble in the eighteenth century, and it contributed largely to a political revolution. In Canada the question never became so acute, for reasons which the writer points out, but it was always a thorn in the sides of both British and Canadian governments.

The writer traces clearly and convincingly the course of events, showing

how each crisis, at home or abroad, had its effects upon ideas of national defense and programs of military development. Relations with the United States were of predominant influence. "The strength of the garrison of Canada registers like a barometer the condition of Anglo-American relations." But anything affecting the military situation of the mother country affected also the military situation in Canada—the Crimean War, the Seven Weeks' War, the Franco-Prussian War, all come in for notice.

However sentiment might change, in England or in Canada, the old problem remained. The ultimate solution, as the writer shows, came not from the political relations of Canada and the mother country but from consideration of the situation of the British army throughout the world. The burden of defense became too heavy to be borne by any army that Britain could maintain. Lord Cardwell, in his great army reforms of 1870, showed that colonial garrisons everywhere had to be greatly reduced. Stern necessity forced the cutting of the Gordian knot, and all concerned suddenly found that they were the better off for the cutting. Speaking in his final paragraph of Canada's military achievements in 1914-1918, the writer says: "It may not be altogether fanciful to consider these achievements fruits, in some sort, of those new responsibilities which Canada accepted so hesitantly in 1871; nor to regard them as returns, tardy yet not ungenerous, for the protection which the mother country had afforded her in the days of her weakness."

*Army War College.* OLIVER L. SPAULDING.

## FAR EASTERN HISTORY

*Togo and the Rise of Japanese Sea Power.* By EDWIN A. FALK. With a foreword by Rear Admiral Bradley A. Fiske, U.S.N., retired. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1936. Pp. xiii, 508. $4.00.)

JAPAN became a great naval power during Togo Heihachiro's life (1848-1934). Serving in all the grades from ensign to admiral, he was a participant in the events which marked this process and in his last years became the living representative of it. This coincidence makes possible a full-width study of the rise of Japanese sea power, framing within it a biography of its exponent.

After service as a junior officer in the Japanese civil war of 1868, Togo was sent to England for a period of training, typical of his nation's study at the feet of the greatest maritime power of the West. In the first test of Japan's new navy, the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895), Togo commanded a cruiser at the victories of the Yalu and Wei-hai-wei. When Japan faced a great European power in the war with Russia, Togo was in command of the fleet which destroyed Russia's sea power in the East at Port Arthur and the Straits of Tsushima. The long years which remained in Togo's life saw

no decline from this pinnacle of fame but continued effectiveness in shaping Japanese naval policy.

Edwin A. Falk, a former officer in the United States Naval Reserve and author of *Fighting Bob Evans,* shows the reader Japan's development in the use of modern ships and naval tactics. He paints the quiet, persistant, stubborn, able, reliable officer, who by the fortunes of chronology and hard work, rather than by transcendent genius, typified all this. It is difficult from this account to rate Togo as a brilliant commander. His decisions were sometimes characterized by overcaution. The fact that his opponents were always his inferiors in equipment and training makes a fair evaluation impossible.

Unfamiliarity with Japanese and the absence of personal manuscript sources have handicapped the author. Japanese official papers, published or in manuscript, were not available. His use of authorized biographies, memoirs, and contemporary published accounts, besides strictly secondary works, is excellent, and the narrative convinces the reader of careful preparation and sound perception. Strategy and tactics are described in detail but with lucidity. A series of well-designed charts, an extensive bibliography, and an index increase the usefulness of the book.

It is possible to find slips in spelling and terminology, and the feeling of objectivity is lessened by frequent references to and comparisons with "the present". The bibliographical notations in the footnotes are sometimes misleading as to the exact or approximate title indicated. But on the whole, Falk has done an excellent piece of work, not only as a biographer but in producing something broader than a biography: the history of the development of a great naval power.

*Pomona College.* JOHN HASKELL KEMBLE.

*The Basis of Japanese Foreign Policy.* By ALBERT E. HINDMARSH, Assistant Professor of International Law, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1936. Pp. x, 265. $2.50.)

THE author believes that the inefficacy of the postwar peace structure stems from attempts to "solve" international difficulties which take no account of basic internal problems out of which international policies logically develop. In the present volume, therefore, he examines the domestic situation in Japan for the purpose of discovering why Dai Nippon has embarked upon her recent continental expansion. The major driving force behind this expansion, both territorial and economic, he finds in the pressure of population, the implications of which are set forth in extensive statistical tables. By way of correcting what appears to be an overemphasis, it should be said, however, that a population problem must be seen not merely in its relation to such factors as land area, natural resources, and comparable figures for other countries. Population is relative also to a prevailing economic and social system.

Having examined population statistics at length, the author surveys the proposed solutions, including birth control, migration within the empire and emigration beyond its borders, agricultural expansion and improvement, and finally industrialization and trade expansion. Industrialization, accompanied by the search after both foreign markets and sources of raw materials, inclines the nation naturally toward territorial expansion. Without attempting to justify Japan's recent policies on either moral or legal grounds, the author, in the role of a materialist rather than a realist, concludes with this observation: "Given Japan's basic problem [population] and the practicable alternative solutions, it is difficult to see how any very different policies could have been pursued by far-sighted and realistic statesmen." Among the proposed remedies for population pressure little if any attention is given, however, to radical proposals for a drastic modification of the structure of industrial and finance capitalism, with particular reference to rural credit and agrarian landlordism.

The author's basic thesis is sound and is well supported by an almost overwhelming mass of factual data. The weakness of the study lies in the scantiness of the historical background, noticeable particularly in the introductory chapter, in the treatment given to the London Naval Treaty of 1930 and the political assassinations of 1932-1936, and in the absence of any reference to the constitutional struggle which dates from the early 1870's. Active Japanese interest in the population question, incidentally, did not originate in the 1920's. It is evident as early as 1905 in public discussions of the Korean problem.

*The University of Washington.* R. T. Pollard.

*Foreign Policy in the Far East.* By Taraknath Das, Sometime Special Lecturer on Far Eastern Affairs, The Catholic University of America. With a Foreword by Herbert Wright. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1936. Pp. xv, 272. $2.00.)

Dr. Das has unusual qualifications for giving American readers a picture of world affairs from the Oriental viewpoint. A Hindu by birth, he left his native land in 1904 for Japan, where he spent a year watching at close range the stirring events of the Russo-Japanese War. In 1905 he arrived in the United States to complete his education and to become, in 1914, a naturalized American citizen. Graduating from the University of Washington in 1910 and receiving his A. M. in the following year, he continued his studies at various American and European institutions, specializing in international relations, and in 1924 obtained his Ph. D. from Georgetown University. Since 1923 he has been busy as writer and lecturer upon topics relating primarily to European activities and policies in the Far East.

The eight lectures comprising the volume now under review were originally delivered during the summer of 1934 and the spring of 1935 in Wash-

ington and Philadelphia. In these the author criticizes the claims of the West to intellectual and cultural superiority over the East, traces the development of European imperialism in Asia, and urges the right of the Oriental peoples to continue, as free nations, their own independent contributions to world culture. European imperialism (he gives the United States a fairly clean record on this score and commends the "good neighbor" policy of President Franklin D. Roosevelt) lies at the root of the evils now afflicting mankind; if world peace is ever to become a reality, the West must abandon *macht politik* and must allow the nations of the East to develop as free and equal members of the human family.

As a historical record the lectures are marred by a number of inaccuracies, some of them important. These errors may perhaps be dismissed as the results of hasty work; yet even so, and despite the ability with which the author develops his major themes, the book as a whole fails to carry conviction. Its denunciation of imperialism when European policies are under consideration gives way to a defense of imperialism when an Oriental power, Japan, is concerned; for Japan, so we are given to understand, has been forced by dire necessity to imitate the evil ways of the West. Japanese imperialism, however, did not originate in the nineteenth or even in the sixteenth century, and if the imperialistic program of any single country can be justified on grounds of economic or military necessity, the whole case against imperialism must be thrown out of court. So long as Dr. Das devotes himself to the fallacies of racial superiority and inferiority, so long as he argues for a world order based upon mutual tolerance and respect, his presentation of the facts is impressive and convincing; when he dwells upon the iniquity of Britain, Russia, France, Italy, and Germany in contrast with the righteousness of Japan and the United States, his pages become heavily charged with special pleading and lose their power of enlightenment.

*Simmons College.* G. Nye Steiger.

# NOTICES OF OTHER RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## GENERAL HISTORY

*The Columbia Encyclopedia.* Compiled and edited at Columbia University. CLARKE F. ANSLEY, Editor in Chief. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1935, pp. 1949, $17.50.) *The Columbia Encyclopedia,* according to Dr. Ansley, is "primarily for American use". This statement is borne out by an analysis of the way in which the 52,753 entries in this new one-volume reference work are divided. Of the more than 16,000 biographical entries, 5000 are American—a greater number than in any other work in a single volume, according to the publishers. Of the 18,000 entries on geography, 8000 are American. American history articles account for one-quarter of the 4000 entries on the general subject of history, and the longest article in the book is that on the United States. Many other articles which in one sense are not in the field of history have been linked to that field by the way in which they have been written. For example, the article on "rifle" gives technical information about the subject but is equally devoted to the story of the part it played in American history. *The Columbia Encyclopedia* has also taken care to make itself up to date in both American and foreign affairs, science, and biography. It includes articles on adult education, air conditioning, Hermann Goering, relativity, Tennessee Valley Authority, television, Grant Wood, Harold C. Urey, Thomas Wolfe, Tel-Aviv, etc. Most of the articles have bibliographies, there being in all a reference list of more than 24,000 books. The attempt has been to write on all subjects in nontechnical language, and the editors make no pretense of instructing a specialist in his own field. It is thus intended primarily for the layman or for the use of experts in fields other than their own.

*El erudito español D. Manuel Serrano y Sanz.* Articles by F. LAYNA SERRANO, J. Mª. BENAVENTE and OTHERS. (Madrid, Nuevas Graficas, Rodriguez San Pedro, 1935, pp. 161.) Every investigator who ever met Don Manuel will read this volume of homage with affection and a deep sense of loss. Of a "curiosidad insaciable y fecunda", he published valuable studies on early Florida and Louisiana and on the Choctaws and Cherokees of the second half of the eighteenth century. The book contains a biography, a full bibliography, and numerous touching tributes. May much-maligned Spain continue to give us such combinations of profound scholarship and lovable character!

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

*A Survey of European Civilization.* Part I, *To 1660.* By WALLACE K. FERGUSON. Part II, *Since 1660.* By GEOFFREY BRUUN. Under the editorial supervision of CARL L. BECKER. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1936, pp. xxxiii, 1025, xcii, $4.50.) This is a comprehensive general textbook on the history of Western Europe from the decline of the Roman Empire to the rise of the Nazis in the new German Reich. The distribution of space will appeal to the majority of progressive teachers of European history. Out of a total of 1025 pages about 735 cover the period from the beginning through the Napoleonic era. Almost as much space is given to the twentieth century as to the nineteenth, which represents a far cry from the theory popular a generation ago that no scholar could write real history on the period since the Franco-Prussian War. As a whole, the

book is an admirable general history of Western Europe. It well illustrates the progress in historical writing and studying since James Harvey Robinson published his memorable *History of Western Europe* more than thirty years ago. That such works as the present are possible today is due in a considerable degree to the break with tradition that Professor Robinson's volume effected. The general intellectual pattern and frame of reference is political and diplomatic but with an unusually large allotment of space to social, economic, and cultural history. The outlook of the book is liberal and the interpretations very generally judicious. The summary of the difficult problem of war guilt is actually statesmanlike in its penetration. The physical aspects of the book are admirable. It is clearly printed and generously supplied with fine maps and illuminating illustrations. Genealogical tables, lists of rulers and dynasties, and a good bibliography are included in an ample appendix. But this can hardly be called a history of European civilization if there is any real difference between a textbook and an admirably proportioned general history of Europe.

HARRY ELMER BARNES.

*Zufall oder Schicksal: Der vorzeitige Tod entscheidender Männer der deutschen Geschichte.* By C. H. VON ECKARTSBERG. (Munich, R. Oldenbourg, 1935, pp. 219, 5.80 M.) Although this book belongs to the field of the philosophy of history, there is little of the metaphysical about it. Very factually, but for the most part not basically in the sources, its author sets about the study of seven important persons in eight centuries of German history to see, putting it broadly, what might have happened if these men had not died suddenly *in medias res.* He is not interested in the problem of personality as such and thinks that his purpose can better be accomplished by probing into periods in which crucial decisions lay with more ordinary men in key positions. Their factoral weight and fundamental uniqueness, as well as the other elements entering into their situations, can, he thinks, be reasonably well determined. His selection is indisputably apt: Otto II prematurely cut off while pursuing his father's imperial policy; Henry III followed by a son unhappily geared to the rising papal power; Henry VI coming between two towering though errant personalities; Albert I inaugurating an imperialism based on *Hausmacht;* Albert II fortifying his German power with alien props; Maurice of Saxony and Wallenstein, not of royal blood, done away with at crucial moments in the wars over the new disintegrating element of religious difference. Obviously the author's analyses must suffer from overcondensation, causing omissions of some consequence and, occasionally, overstatements. Philosophically, also, his work is colored by the thinking of the authors on whom he relies—Ranke, Lamprecht, and Hampe and other contributors to the *Propyläen-Weltgeschichte.* His conclusion: even the ordinary man has his importance in the course of history. FRANCIS J. TSCHAN.

*Bibliografia missionaria. (1. VII, 1934—31. XII, 1935).* Compiled by P. GIOVANNI ROMMERSKIRCHEN with the assistance of P. GIOVANNI DINDINGER. (Rome, Unione missionaria del clero in Italia, 1936, pp. 191, 5 l.) This is an exhaustive and carefully prepared bibliography of the literature on Catholic missions throughout the world which has appeared from July 1, 1934, to December 31, 1935. In addition it contains material supplementary to the valuable *Guida delle missioni cattoliche* and a list of periodicals, dealing with Catholic missions, that are available at the Pontificia Biblioteca Missionaria in Rome. GAUDENS MEGARO.

*Chapters in Anglo-Portuguese Relations.* Edited by EDGAR PRESTAGE. (Watford, Voss and Michael, 1935, pp. vii, 198, 7*s.* 6*d.*) Events conspire to give a fascinat-

ing actuality to this collection of recent lectures. Chapter IV, on the treaties of 1642, 1654, and 1661, by Professor Prestage, and V, on the treaties of 1703, by Sir Richard Lodge, throw new light on Portugal's international affiliations. In chapter VI Professor Prestage condenses his observations on Portuguese character as affected by the country's huge expansion. Chapter I, by Professor H. A. R. Gibb, discusses the little-known topic of English crusaders in Portugal, and in chapter II, Professor C. H. Williams describes John of Gaunt's expedition to the peninsula and its consequences. Captain C. R. Boxer devotes chapter III to the Anglo-Portuguese rivalry of 1615-1635 in the Persian Gulf, rendered more exciting by the daring of Ruy Freyre and Gonçalo da Silveira's dash up the Euphrates to Babylon—the whole a stimulating commentary on the influence of sea power on history. Interesting are Boxer's notes on the Assyrian Christians, still good fighters in 1918, and amusing anecdotes of Sousa de Macedo, ambassador in London in the mid-seventeenth century, detailed by Prestage. The treaty of May 16, 1703, in which the allies promised Portugal Vigo and Badajoz, met the same fate as those of the World War with Italy and Rumania. Perusal of scores of Brazilian and Portuguese colonization documents would lead me to modify Prestage's statement: "The first 200 years of the history of Brazil is largely one of a struggle by the Jesuits to protect the native Indians from the rapacity of the colonists"; there were brilliant and honorable exceptions, but alas, there was much exploitation of the Indians by the religious orders also. But in general one admires wholeheartedly the scholarship and the style of this collection, in spite of the evidence of haste seen in the misprints and in the lack of an index.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

*Crónica de Dom João de Castro, by Leonardo Nunes.* Edited with an Introduction by J. D. M. FORD. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1936, pp. xxviii, 241, $2.50.) Leonardo Nunes served in India as soldier and scribe under the great Portuguese captain Dom João de Castro (1500-1548). He wrote two accounts of the second siege of Diu and the wars immediately following: a summary (22 chapters), published under the title *Historia Quinhentista* at Coimbra in 1925, and the present work, later and longer (39 chapters), now printed for the first time. The autograph manuscript, signed on February 22, 1550, forms part of the Palha collection in the library of Harvard University. Devoid of embellishment, the narrative enthralls at times by sheer vividness of description. The author was a participant, often an eyewitness, a naïve but not a clumsy writer. No one who reads can doubt that Nunes took pains to learn the facts and to relate them with exactness. National partisanship runs strong in this story of courage and bloodshed, but the customary cruelties of war are set down impartially and without comment. The publication of this and the prior history means that biographies of Dom João de Castro can be enriched by new authentic details and that a modest niche must henceforth be provided in histories of Portuguese literature for Leonardo Nunes. The text, prepared by Professor Ford with the aid of Mr. M. I. Raphael, is carefully and beautifully printed. It is presented as bare source material, without historical notes (save one alone, p. 18) or index. A concise introduction furnishes the minimum of background and the needful information concerning manuscript and author. It is really a matter for regret that the collaboration of a historical expert was not secured, so that this first edition of the work might have been made as nearly as possible definitive.

S. GRISWOLD MORLEY.

*Costume and Conduct in the Laws of Basel, Bern, and Zurich, 1370-1800.* By JOHN MARTIN VINCENT. [The Johns Hopkins Historical Publications.] (Baltimore,

Johns Hopkins Press, 1935, pp. xii, 170, $2.50.) Despite its brevity, this scholarly study of the sumptuary legislation of Basel, Bern, and Zurich contains much detailed information that should be of interest to social historians not only of Switzerland but of the neighboring countries as well. For the laws cited here, regulating in minute detail the clothing and social customs of all classes, were typical of their age. The decrees on costume by themselves provide material for a history of European fashions over a period of four centuries, and these are here supplemented by a number of well-chosen illustrations. There is also a good deal of valuable evidence regarding social and economic theory and practice. The city fathers were evidently anxious to discourage extravagance, for their economic theory still regarded thrift as a prime economic virtue, and they were also determined to maintain class distinctions by forbidding the wearing of apparel above one's station. In other cases the prohibitions regarding dress, especially of women, and conduct at such festive occasions as weddings, christenings, and funerals were obviously inspired by moral considerations. Still other regulations seem to have had no other motive than a conservative or patriotic dislike of new or foreign, in either case outlandish, fashions and, judging from the illustrations, were not always without justification. A number of statistical tables in the appendix afford at least a partial answer to the inevitable question as to how much of this restrictive legislation was ever enforced.

WALLACE K. FERGUSON.

*Le traité de Bjoerkoë, 1905: Un essai d'alliance de l'Allemagne, la Russie, et la France.* By J.-P. REINACH. (Paris, Félix Alcan, 1935, pp. 204.) This is a simple and straightforward narrative of the famous maneuver by which "Willy" tried to draw "Nicky" into a defensive alliance against England. France was to be induced to join it at the close of the Russo-Japanese War, thus realizing the Kaiser's fond idea of a Continental league composed of the members of the Triple and Dual alliances. Aside from emphasizing the intriguing and dishonest tendencies of German foreign policy, M. Reinach adds little or nothing to what is already familiar to historians. In style he appears to emulate Maurice Paléologue but lacks that prolific writer's artistic touch and inside information. Several proper names are misspelled. There are no footnotes or references to authorities. The meager bibliography of two dozen titles at the close of the volume omits several important works, such as the best large monograph on the subject by Walter Klein (Berlin, 1931). SIDNEY B. FAY.

*An Introduction to a Bibliography of the Paris Peace Conference.* By NINA ALMOND and RALPH HASWELL LUTZ. (Stanford University, Stanford University Press, 1935, pp. 32.) This is the second number to appear of a bibliographical series authorized by the directors of the Hoover War Library in 1925. It is designed to accompany one of the volumes of their publications, *The Treaty of St. Germain.* It includes only collections of sources, archive publications, and source books. The entries are arranged under four main headings: Armistice Materials, Pre-Conference Materials, Conference Materials, and Materials on Relief Operations in Europe during the Conference Period.

*Our Contemporary Civilization: a Study of the Twentieth Century Renaissance.* By ROSCOE LEWIS ASHLEY. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1935, pp. xv, 608, $2.90.) This book constitutes an analysis of what the author calls the "Twentieth Century Renaissance", written apparently for students of the junior-college level. It includes not only an appraisal of past and contemporary conditions but also a consideration of future trends. The "Renaissance" is treated

frankly though not exclusively from the American viewpoint, but there is no provincialism in the approach. A résumé of "Historical Transformations" (Part I) pictures the modern world in Heraclitean flux, with revolutions—commercial, industrial, political—creating a system which in spite of notable material and technological achievements is threatened with self-destruction in the "Dilemma of Industrialism and Capitalism" (Part II). Rapid but incomplete transformations have left certain "cultural lags" in law, education, religion, etc., where vermiform appendixes of the old order continue to disturb the digestive processes of the new. Palliative measures have proved of doubtful success and resort must be had to the scalpel of intelligent planning, wielded presumably by the "social engineer". Fundamental to any organic cure is a political or "Public Reorganization" (Part III), not to be sought in any current European "ism" but in a democracy wherein rugged individualism has been tempered by a socialized conscience. Problems of the "Cultural Renaissance" are given specific consideration in Part IV, which ends with a plea for a "New Philosophy of Civilization". If many questions are raised which have not or cannot be answered, if some of the suggestions made fail to satisfy a given reader, if much of the material is perforce controversial, the fault lies rather with the problems than with the author. He offers no dogmatically formulated solutions, only "an honest attempt to diagnose". JAMES LEA CATE.

ARTICLES

VISCOUNT SANKEY. The Historian and the Lawyer. *History*, Sept.

R. L. SCHUYLER. Indeterminism in Physics and History. *Social Stud.*, Dec.

RUSSELL H. ANDERSON. Grain Drills through Thirty-Nine Centuries. *Agricultural Hist.*, Oct.

L. C. HOPKINS. The Cas-chrom v. the Lei-ssu: a Study of the Primitive Forms of the Plough in Scotland and Ancient China [cont.]. *Jour. Roy. Asiatic Soc.*, Jan.

CARL WHITING BISHOP. Origin and Early Diffusion of the Traction-plough. *Antiquity*, Sept.

ROLAND H. BAINTON. Changing Ideas and Ideals in the Sixteenth Century. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Dec.

J. L. M. FRANKEN and E. COPE DI VALROMITA, eds. L'Abissinia in alcune inchieste di funzionari olandesi del sec. XVII. *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, June.

## ANCIENT HISTORY

*T. R. S. Broughton*

*Les premières civilisations.* By GUSTAVE FOUGÈRES, GEORGES CONTENAU, PIERRE JOUGUET, RENÉ GROUSSET, JEAN LESQUIER. Troisième édition. [Peuples et civilisations.] (Paris, Félix Alcan, 1935, pp. vii, 491, 50 fr.) The third edition of this work differs from the second in the addition of an appendix of nineteen pages on "les résultats des dernières fouilles et des dernières recherches (1929-1935)". The appendix is in four sections, dealing, respectively, with the peoples of the Near East, Egypt, the Indo-Europeans and their migrations, and the Aegean and Hellenic world, each with a bibliographical note. This reviewer sees no reason to revise the adverse judgments passed upon the second edition by his father in this journal (XXXV, 389). ROBERT SAMUEL ROGERS.

*History of Ancient Civilization.* By ALBERT A. TREVER. Volume I, *The Ancient Near East and Greece.* (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1936, pp. xx, 585, $3.50.) In this first volume of a two-volume work intended as a textbook for college students Professor Trever covers the history of the ancient world

from the Old Stone Age through the Hellenistic period. After a brief but sufficient summary of prehistoric times he devotes seven chapters to a survey of the history of the ancient Near East and the remaining twenty-four to the story of the Hellenes. The political history is treated in summary fashion so that space may be devoted to a study of institutions, economic life, religion, and culture, the whole being arranged by periods. Professor Trever has approached the work with a thorough and up-to-date knowledge of the sources and literature of the subject and with the aptitude of an experienced teacher. The result is a sound and capable though not brilliant work which, with its companion volume, should prove extremely useful as a text for year courses in ancient history. The treatment of the Orient is competent, and the influence of the East on the rising Hellenes is properly noted. In dealing with the Greeks the author properly lays much emphasis upon the cultural aspects of Greek life, particularly upon literature. The concluding chapter is a fine summary of the "Hellenic Heritage to Western Civilization". Constant citations of ancient authors to illuminate historical events, to furnish contemporary opinions, and to provide examples of literary works add spice to the narrative. Illustrations, chronological tables, and a well-chosen series of maps add to the value of the book. The carefully selected bibliography contains most works of importance for college teachers and students who may not be specialists. Of distinct use is a list of translations of the Greek classics. WALLACE E. CALDWELL.

*Les Hittites.* By LOUIS DELAPORTE. [L'évolution de l'humanité.] (Paris, La Renaissance du Livre, 1936, pp. x, 371, 40 fr.) The recovery of the story of Hittite civilization is one of the romantic victories of modern research. That there was a civilization which could be called by that name was undreamed of until sixty years ago, and it is not yet twenty years since Hrozny published the first tentative translations of one of the records of the great Hittite Empire, that had its seat in Asia Minor, 1400-1200 B.C. Now, owing to the combined labors of a dozen devoted scholars, the history of that empire and the nature of its civilization can be told. Professor Delaporte has in this volume told it in a fascinating way, having laid under contribution the work of all his fellow laborers. He makes the reader acquainted with the Hittite country, the history of the empire and the sources of that history, the organization of the state, its law, civil and penal, its religion and myths, its language, and its arts. The book concludes with a brief survey of the later Hittite states, of whose history much less is known. The sources of the history of the empire were written in the cuneiform characters of Babylonia and in a language akin to the tongues of the Indo-European group; the inscriptions of the later Hittite states are written in Hittite hieroglyphs, which are not yet deciphered, hence much less is known concerning them. For one desiring a comprehensive survey of what is known of this great people, Delaporte's book is by far the best in existence. GEORGE A. BARTON.

*Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation under Tiberius.* By ROBERT SAMUEL ROGERS. [American Philological Association.] (Lancaster, Lancaster Press, 1935, pp. ix, 216, $2.75.) The author discusses in chronological order every extant reference to criminal prosecutions and criminal legislation under Tiberius, and his book is the most convenient and complete assemblage of the material on the subject in English which we have seen. His discussions are often acute, but in some instances seem to display a lack of historical judgment. Surely the suggestion of Heidel, which Rogers adopts (p. 34), that the expulsion of the Jews from Rome in 19 A.D. was occasioned by the discovery in the course of an investiga-

tion by Tiberius himself that sexual prostitution was practiced at the Temple in Jerusalem is incredible. The service of Jehovah had been purged of ritual prostitution by the Deuteronomic Code of 621 B.C.; and if there was one thing above another which was notoriously characteristic of orthodox Judaism, it was an abhorrence of the practice. In some cases the author is uncritical in his use of the *Digest*. There are other details in his discussions to which exception might be taken. In one major respect his presentation is disappointing. He ignores utterly the fundamental constitutional problem of the origin and nature of the senatorial jurisdiction and of the so-called "Court of the Princeps". The student of that problem, however, and of all other problems relating to criminal procedure under the early empire will find Rogers's collection of references invaluable.

DONALD MCFAYDEN.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ARTICLES

J. CHARBONNEAUX *et al.* Bulletin archéologique. *Rev. Études Grec.*, Apr.
U. WILCKEN. Urkunden-Referat. *Arch. f. Papyrusf.*, XII, nos. 1-2.
L. WENGER. Juristische Literaturübersicht. *Ibid.*
H. J. MILNE. Bibliography of Graeco-Roman Egypt: Papyrology (1935). *Jour. Egypt. Arch.*, June.
DE LACY O'LEARY. Bibliography of Christian Egypt (1935-6). *Ibid.*
A. KURFESS. Sallustbericht über die Jahre, 1926-1935. *Bursians Jahresber.*, CCLII.
ID. Bericht über Cornelius Nepos, 1926-1934. *Ibid.*
A. GRENIER. Chronique gallo-romaine. *Rev. Études Anc.*, July.

GENERAL ARTICLES

E. CAVAIGNAC. Hittites et Achéens. *Rev. Hitt. et Asian.*, VI, no. 21.
G. CONTENAU. L'assyriologie et les études hittites depuis 1928. *Rev. Hist.*, May.
CARL V. SØLVER. Egyptian Shipping of about 1500 B. C. *Mariner's Mirror*, Oct.
E. R. GOODENOUGH. Archaeology and Jewish History. *Jour. Bibl. Lit.*, Sept.
E. GRANT. The Philistines. *Ibid.*
F. G. CLAPP. The Site of Sodom and Gomorrah. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, July.
C. VELLAY. La question de Troie: Homère contre Hissarlik. *Class. Philol.*, Oct.
H. HERTER. Theseus der Jonier. *Rhein. Museum*, LXXXV, no. 3.
H. T. WADE-GERY and B. D. MERITT. Pylos and the Assessment of Tribute. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, Oct.
U. KAHRSTEDT. Chalcidic Studies. *Ibid.*
I. BARKAN. Imprisonment as a Penalty in Ancient Athens. *Class. Philol.*, Oct.
GIORGIO PASQUALI. La grande Roma dei Tarquinii. *N. Antol.*, Aug. 16.
W. SCHUBART. Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri. *Arch. f. Papyrusf.*, XII, nos. 1-2.
F. W. WALBANK. The Accession of Ptolemy Epiphanes: a Problem in Chronology. *Jour. Egypt. Arch.*, June.
J. A. O. LARSEN. The Treaty of Peace at the Conclusion of the Second Macedonian War. *Class Philol.*, Oct.
M. GELZER. Die Unterdruckung der Bacchanalien bei Livius. *Hermes*, LXXI, no. 3.
E. BURCK. Staat, Volk und Dichtung im republikanischen Rom. *Ibid.*
H. SIBER. Analogie, Amtsrecht und Rückwirkung im Strafrechte des römischen Freistaates. *Abh. Sächs. Akad.*, XLIII, no. 3.
J. H. THIEL. Kaiser Tiberius. *Mnemos.*, IV, no. 1.
E. G. TURNER. Egypt and the Roman Empire: The Δεκαπρωτοι. *Jour. Egypt. Arch.*, June.
K. A. NEUGEBAUER. Die Familie des Septimius Severus. *Antike*, XII, no. 3.
ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO. La formazione della moderna storiografia sull' impero romano. *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, Mar., June.

### Archaeological Articles

C. F.-A. Schaeffer. Les fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit: Septième campagne. *Syria*, XVII, no. 2.

J. Ony. Excavations at Ras el 'Ain. *Quar. Dept. Antiq. Palestine*, V, no. 4.

J. D. S. Pendlebury *et al.* Journeys in Crete, 1934. *Ann. Brit. School Athens*, XXXIII.

W. A. Heurtley and H. L. Lorimer. Excavations in Ithaca [cont.]. *Ibid.*

E. Curtius. Olympia. *Antike*, XII, no. 3.

E. P. Blegen. News Items from Athens. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, July.

J. H. Iliffe. Sigillata Wares in the Near East: a List of Potter's Stamps. *Quar. Dept. Antiq. Palestine*, V, no. 4.

A. W. Van Buren. News Items from Rome. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, July.

L. Curtius. Ikonographische Beiträge zum Porträt der römischen Republik und der julisch-claudischen Familie. *Röm. Mitteil.*, L, no. 2.

K. Scott. Mercury on the Bologna Altar. *Ibid.*

H. Kähler. Die Porta Aurea in Ravenna. *Ibid.*

H. Seyrig. Les trouvailles de monnaies péloponésiennes et la guerre parthique de Caracalla. *Syria*, XVII, no. 2.

### Literary, Epigraphic, and Papyrological Articles

Rodney Potter Robinson, ed. Philological Studies in Honor of Walter Miller. *Univ. Missouri Stud.*, July.

A. v. Blumenthal. Die archaische Inschrift des Apollontempels in Syrakus. *Röm. Mitteil.*, L, no. 2.

H. T. Wade-Gery. Studies in Attic Inscriptions of the Fifth Century B. C. *Ann. Brit. School Athens*, XXXIII.

J. Brunel. La légende de Comanus. *Rev. Philol.*, Oct.

S. Schiffer. Aristote à Athènes et Callisthène à Babylone. *Rev. Études Anc.*, July.

H. Kortenbeutel. Γυμνάσιον und Βουλή: Eine Ptolemäische Inschrift. *Arch. f. Papyrusf.*, XII, nos. 1-2.

T. C. Skeat. The Epistrategos Hippalos. *Ibid.*

L. Robert. Ἀρχαιολόγος. *Rev. Études Grec.*, Apr.

G. D. Hadzsits. The *Vera Historia* of the Palatine *Ficus Ruminalis*. *Class. Philol.*, Oct.

F. Münzer. Zu den Magistri von Minturae. *Röm. Mitteil.*, L, no. 2.

R. E. Smith. The Greek Letters of M. Junius Brutus. *Class. Quar.*, July.

H. Berve. Zum Monumentum Ancyranum. *Hermes*, LXXI, no. 3.

J. H. Iliffe. The Θάνατος Inscription from Herod's Temple. *Quar. Dept. Antiq. Palestine*, VI, no. 1.

M. Stuart. The Date of the Inscription of Claudius on the Arch of Ticinum. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, July.

W. Schubart. Causa Halensis. *Arch. f. Papyrusf.*, XII, nos. 1-2.

H. C. Youtie and O. M. Pearl. Note on P. Jand, VII, 141. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, Oct.

H. Henne. Sur deux stratèges d'une inscription grecque de Coptos. *Rev. Philol.*, Oct.

A. H. Krappe. La naissance de Commode dans l'Histoire Auguste. *Rev. Études Anc.*, July.

F. Lot. La "Notitia Dignitatum utriusque imperii". *Ibid.*

H. Comfort. Dioscore d'Aphroditô: Cinq locations de terres. *Rev. Études Grec.*, Apr.

### Economic and Social Articles

A. Blakeway. Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Commerce with Italy, Sicily and France in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B. C. *Ann. Brit. School Athens*, XXXIII.

R. J. Forbes. The Nomenclature of Bitumen, Petroleum, Tar, and Allied Products in Antiquity. *Mnemos.*, IV, no. 1.

F. Heichelheim. Nachtrag II zur Prosopographie der auswärtigen Bevölkerung im Ptolemäerreich. *Arch. f. Papyrusf.*, XII, nos. 1-2.

G. Rosenberger. Die Berechnung der Ἐκατοστή von Artaben in dem Papyri. *Ibid.*

## MEDIEVAL HISTORY

*G. C. Boyce*

*El Itinerario de Alfonso el Sabio.* By ANTONIO BALLESTEROS Y BERETTA. Volume I, *1252-1259.* (Madrid, Topografía de Archivos, 1935, 10 pesos.) An itinerary that assumes the proportions and functions of a regesta for the period covered.

*Economic and Social History of Medieval Europe.* By HENRI PIRENNE. (London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Company, 1936, pp. ix, 243, 6*s*.) The survey which Professor Pirenne contributed to the *Histoire du Moyen Age* has been translated by I. E. Clegg and published under this title.

*Medieval Agrarian Economy.* By N. NEILSON. [The Berkshire Studies in European History.] (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1936, pp. vi, 106, $1.00.) The author's well-known enthusiasm for economic studies and the depth of her scholarship lend charm and distinction to the three chapters into which she has divided her narrative. "The Village Framework: Field Systems and Forms of Settlement", "The People of the Village", and "The Village in Relation to King and Church" are the main topics discussed.

*The Renaissance.* By F. FUNCK-BRENTANO. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1936, pp. 320, $2.50.) This is far below the quality of some of the author's earlier works and does not deserve serious attention. The English edition is briefer than the French edition (1935). GAUDENS MEGARO.

### ARTICLES

HENRY OSBORNE TAYLOR. Placing the Middle Ages. *Speculum*, Oct.

ANDREAS L. VEIT. Neuere Arbeiten zur Papstgeschichte [bibliographical article]. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVI, no. 3.

CHARLES E. SCHRADER. The Historical Development of the Papal Monarchy. *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

G. MOLLAT. Contribution à l'histoire de l'administration judiciaire de l'Église romaine au XIV^e^ s. *Rev. Hist. Ecclés.*, Oct.

FRANCIS DARWIN. The Organisation of the Holy Office. *Church Quar. Rev.*, July.

F. WAGNER. L'organisation du combat singulier au moyen âge dans les états scandinaves et dans l'ancienne république islandaise. *Rev. Synthèse*, Feb.

PAUL LEHMANN. Skandinaviens Anteil an der lateinischen Literatur und Wissenschaft des Mittelalters [cont.]. *Sitzungsber. Bay. Akad.*, Apr.

L. LASONDER. Het "Calendarium romano-germanicum medii aevi" van Von Erath. *Ned. Arch.*, 1936, no. 2.

J.-A. VAN HOUTTE. Les courtiers au Moyen Age. *Rev. Hist. Droit Fr. et Étr.*, July.

GINO ARIAS. Le système corporatif en Italie au moyen âge et son influence sur l'économie de l'époque. *Rev. Études Ital.*, Apr.

W. HENNING. Neue Materialen zur Geschichte des Manichäismus. *Zeitsch. Deutsch. Morgenländ. Gesell.*, XC, no. 1.

HANS J. WOLFF. Römische Grundstücksverkaufverträge aus dem Vandalenreich. *Tijdsch. voor Rechtsgesch.*, XIV, no. 4.

FLOYD S. LEAR. St. Isidore and Mediaeval Science. *Rice Inst. Pamphlet*, Apr.

E. AMANN. L'adoptianisme espagnol du VIII siècle. *Rev. Sci. Relig.*, July.

LUIGI EINAUDI. Teoria della moneta immaginaria da Carlo Magno alla Rivoluzione francese. *Riv. Stor. Ec.*, Mar.

MARIO ROQUES. Les Serments de Strasbourg. *Medium Aevum*, Oct.

LOUIS DUPRAZ. Le Capitulaire de Lothaire I, empereur, De expeditione contra Sarracenos facienda, et la Suisse romande, 847. *Zeitsch. f. Schweizer. Gesch.*, XVI, no. 3.

WOLFGANG EICHNER. Die Nachrichten über den Islam bei den Byzantinern. *Islam*, Apr.

F. DVORNIK. Études sur Photios. *Byzantion*, XI, no. 1.

M. CANARD. Arabes et Bulgares au début du X^e^ siècle. *Ibid.*

MATHILDE UHLIRZ. Die Restitution des Exarchates Ravenna durch die Ottonen. *Mitteil. Österr. Inst. f. Geschichtsf.*, L, nos. 1-2.

SAMUEL H. CROSS and K. J. CONANT in collaboration with H. V. MORGILEVSKI (Kiev). The Earliest Mediaeval Churches of Kiev. *Speculum*, Oct.

OSCAR G. DARLINGTON. Gerbert, 'Obscuro Loco Natus'. *Ibid.*

THEODOR SCHIEFFER. Notice sur les Vies de Saint Hugues, abbé de Cluny. *Moyen Age*, Apr.

OTTO KESTNER. Alpenpässe und römische Malaria in der mittelalterlichen Kaiserzeit. *Hist. Vierteljahr.*, July.

OTTO STOLZ. Weistum und Grundherrschaft. *Vierteljahr. f. Soz.- und Wirtschaftsgesch.*, XXIX, no. 2.

HANS WEIRICH. Die Überlieferung des Privilegs Leo's IX. für Hersfeld. *Mitteil. Österr. Inst. f. Geschichtsf.*, L, nos. 1-2.

PHILIPP FUNK. Pseudo-Isidor gegen Heinrichs III. Kirchenhoheit. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVI, no. 3.

CARL ERDMANN. Die Anfänge der staatlichen Propaganda im Investiturstreit. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, Aug.

LUCIE VARGE. Un problème de méthode en histoire religieuse: Le Catharisme. *Rev. Synthèse*, June.

J. W. THOMPSON. Catharist Social Ideas in Medieval French Romance. *Romanic Rev.*, Apr.

D. SALMAN. Algazel et les Latins. *Arch. Hist. Doct. et Litt. du Moyen Age*, X.

MARQUIS DE LA FORCE. Les conseillers latins du basileus Alexius Comnène. *Byzantion*, XI, no. 1.

DAVID KNOWLES. The Case of Saint William of York. *Cam. Hist. Jour.*, V, no. 2.

J. S. P. TATLOCK. The Date of Henry I's Charter to London. *Speculum*, Oct.

GAILLARD LAPSLEY. Some Recent Advance in English Constitutional History, before 1485. *Cam. Hist. Jour.*, V, no. 2.

M. D. CHENU. Grammaire et théologie aux XII^e^ et XIII^e^ siècles. *Arch. Hist. Doct. et Litt. du Moyen Age*, X.

R. SCHMIDT. Heinrich der Löwe: Seine Stellung in der inneren und auswärtigen Politik Deutschlands. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, June.

ULRICH STUTZ. Papst Alexander III. gegen die Freiung Langobardischer Eigenkirchen. *Abh. Berl. Akad.*, 1936, no. 6.

WALTHER FÖHL. Bischof Eberhard II. von Bamberg, ein Staatsmann Friedrichs I., als Verfasser von Briefen und Urkunden. *Mitteil. Österr. Inst. f. Geschichtsf.*, L, nos. 1-2.

ANDRÉ DESCHARD. Les croisades et le rôle qu'y joua la marine. *Rev. Études Hist.*, Apr.

JOSEF STRZYGOWSKI. Ruins of Tombs of the Latin Kings on the Haram in Jerusalem. *Speculum*, Oct.

EDMOND FARAL. Geoffroy Villehardouin: La question de sa sincerité. *Rev. Hist.*, May.

KONRAD BURDACH. Die Wahl Friedrichs II. zum römischen Kaiser. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, Aug.

RUTH J. DEAN. An Anglo-Norman Version of Grosseteste: Part of his Suidas and Testamenta XII Patriarcharum. *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, Sept.

H. J. FLEURE. The Historic City in Western and Central Europe. *Bull. John Rylands Library*, July.

CHARLES PETIT-DUTAILLIS. La concession de commune en France. *Acad. Inscr. et Belles-Lettres, Comptes Rendus*, Apr.

J. R. HULBERT. English in Manorial Documents of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. *Mod. Philol.*, Aug.

ROBERT LATOUCHE. Agrarzustände im westlichen Frankreich während des Hochmittelalters. *Vierteljahr. f. Soz.- und Wirtschaftsgesch.*, XXIX, no. 2.

HERBERT SCHLENGER. Untersuchungen und Darstellungen zur deutschen Siedlungskunde. *Ibid.*

FRITZ ERNST. Reichs- und Landespolitik im Süden Deutschlands am Ende des Mittelalters. *Hist. Vierteljahr.*, July.

MARC BLOCH. Sur le passé de la noblesse française: quelques jalons de recherche. *An. Hist. Éc. et Soc.*, July.

MICHAEL SEIDLMAYER. Das mittelalterliche Kaisertum und die deutsche Ostkolonisation. *Röm. Quartalsch.*, XLIII, nos. 3-4.

HERBERT LUDAT. Der Ursprung des ostdeutschen Wieken. *Vierteljahr. f. Soz.- und Wirtschaftsgesch.*, XXIX, no. 2.

BERTHOLD ALTANER. Zur Geschichte der anti-islamischen Polemik während des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts [bibliographical article]. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVI, no. 2.

D. O. LOTTIN. Commentaire des Sentences et Somme théologique d'Albert le Grand. *Rech. Théol. Anc. et Méd.*, Apr.

WERNER GEBAUER. Die Aufnahme der Politik des Aristoteles und die naturrechtliche Begründung des Staates durch Thomas von Aquino. *Vierteljahr. f. Soz.- und Wirtschaftsgesch.*, XXIX, no. 2.

E. F. JACOB. Some Notes on Occam as a Political Thinker. *Bull. John Rylands Library*, July.

L. BAUDRY. Sur trois manuscrits occamistes. *Arch. Hist. Doct. et Litt. du Moyen Age*, X.

LYNN THORNDIKE. Some Later Medieval Latin Medical MSS at Bern and Prag. *An. Med. Hist.*, 1936, no. 5.

ARRIGO SOLMI. Francesco Petrarca e l' Italia. *N. Antol.*, Sept. 1.

E. PERROY. Franco-English Relations, 1350-1400. *History*, Sept.

W. A. PANTIN. The *Defensorium* of Adam Easton. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

ANTHONY STEEL. English Government Finance, 1377-1413. *Ibid.*

GINO LUZZATTO. Sindacati e cartelli nel commercio veneziano dei secoli XIII e XIV. *Riv. Stor. Ec.*, Mar.

HEINRICH FINKE. Des aragonischen Hofnarren Mossén Borra Berichte aus Deutschland, 1417. 1418. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVI, no. 2.

WILLIBRORD HUG. Visitationsrezess aus der Strassburger Kartause vom Jahre 1418. *Ibid.*, no. 3.

LYNN THORNDIKE. Johann Virdung of Hassfurt again. *Isis*, Sept.

GUSTAVE DUPONT-FERRIER. Les origines et le premier siècle de la Cour du Trésor. *Rev. Hist.*, July.

ANDREAS L. VEIT. Neue Forschungen zur mittelalterlichen Rechtsgeschichte Spaniens [bibliographical]. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVI, no. 2.

JOHANNES VINCKE. Kirche und Staat in Spanien während des Spätmittelalters. *Rom. Quartalsch.*, XLIII, nos. 1-2.

FRIEDRICH STEGMÜLLER. Pedro de Osma: Ein Beitrag zur spanischen Universitäts-, Konzils- und Ketzergeschichte. *Ibid.*, nos. 3-4.

F. R. SALTER. The Jews in Fifteenth-Century Florence and Savonarola's Establishment of a *Mons Pietatis*. *Cam. Hist. Jour.*, V, no. 2.

B. BEHRENS. Treatises on the Ambassador written in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

ALBERT BRACKMANN. Der mittelalterliche Ursprung der Nationalstaaten. *Sitzungsber. Berl. Akad. der Wissen.*, XIII.

DOCUMENTS

MAX-JOSEPH MIDUNSKY. Die Urkunde Papst Hadrians IV. für das Bistum Breslau vom Jahre 1155. *Zeitsch. Vereins f. Gesch. Schlesiens*, 1936.

A. LANDGRAF. Untersuchungen zu den Paulinenkommentaren des 12. Jahrhunderts. *Rech. Théol. Anc. et Méd.*, July.

RAYMONDE FOREVILLE. Une lettre inédite de Jean de Salisbury, évêque de Chartes. *Rev. Hist. de l'Église de France*, Apr.

GINA FASOLI. Guelfi e Ghibellini di Romagna nel 1280-1281. *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 1936, no. 2.

GEORGE W. CORNER. A Thirteenth Century Medical Cryptogram. *Bull. Inst. Hist. Medicine, Johns Hopkins Univ.*, Nov.

HEKTOR AMMANN. Mittelalterliche Zolltarife aus der Schweiz. *Zeitsch. f. Schweiz. Gesch.*, XVI, no. 2.

C. R. CHENEY. Norwich Cathedral Priory in the Fourteenth Century. *Bull. John Rylands Library*, Jan.

V. ĆOROVIĆ. Der Friedensvertrag zwischen dem Sultan Bayazid II. und dem König Ladislaus II. *Zeitsch. Deutsch. Morgenländ. Gesell.*, XC, no. 1.

## MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

### The United Kingdom and the British Empire

*R. L. Schuyler*

*Illustrated Regional Guides to Ancient Monuments under the Ownership or Guardianship of His Majesty's Office of Works.* Volume II, *Southern England;* volume III, *East Anglia and Midlands.* By the Rt. Hon. W. Ormsby Gore. (London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1936, pp. 86; 72, 1*s.* each.) This series of guides is intended for the use of visitors to the ancient monuments of Great Britain, the word ancient being extended to cover the medieval and renaissance periods. In the first volume Mr. Ormsby Gore dealt with the six northern counties of England. In these two volumes the monuments are described in their chronological and historical settings and listed county by county, with the hours of opening, the cost of admission, and the nearest railway station. Later volumes will deal with Wales and Scotland.

*Camden Miscellany.* Volume XVI. [Camden Third Series.] (London, Royal Historical Society, 1936, pp. vii, 47; ix, 45; xiv, 128; xviii, 55; viii, 15.) This volume includes four pieces dating from the first half of the seventeenth century and a calendar of papers relating to Sir Nathaniel Bacon of Stiffkey, justice of the peace of Norfolk under Elizabeth and James I. This last is entitled "Supplementary Stiffkey Papers", being supplementary to a collection of the official papers of Bacon published by the Camden Society in 1915. "The State of England Anno Dom. 1600 by Thomas Wilson" is edited from two manuscripts found in the Domestic State Papers of Elizabeth. Though Wilson was not always accurate, his use of statistical material gives value to his writing; of especial importance is his estimate of the numbers and incomes of the various sections of the upper classes. "Discours of the Turkes by S^r^. Thomas Sherley" is printed from a manuscript now in the Library of Lambeth Palace. It represents notes taken by the writer during an enforced sojourn in Constantinople, where he was imprisoned by the Turks. Sherley was a keen observer, and his description of Turkish manners and customs is, in the words of the editor of the manuscript, Mr. E. Denison Ross, "amazingly accurate, in view of the short period of liberty that he spent in Constantinople". "A Relation of a Short Survey of the Western Counties" is the record of a tour made in 1635 by a lieutenant in the Norwich militia named Hammond. He has much to say about churches, country houses, and inns. He was evidently a jovial high churchman, interested in antiquities and addicted to wine, ale, and sack, and the companionship of "merry blades". "A Probate Inventory of Goods and Chattles of Sir John Eliot, Late Prisoner in the Tower, 1633" is edited by Professor Harold Hulme from a manuscript which he found while working in the papers of Sir John Eliot at Port Eliot in St. Germans, Cornwall.

*The Tudors: Personalities and Practical Politics in Sixteenth Century England.* By Conyers Read. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1936, pp. xi, 264, $1.75.) This book is worthy of the high reputation its author has won as an authority on sixteenth century history. It supplies a clear and well-balanced history of Tudor England, woven around the lives of the sovereigns. It is eminently fair, without special pleading or prejudice. On the whole, it reflects the moderate Protestant point of view and adopts much the same interpretation as A. F. Pollard's writings. Perhaps there is too much commentary and too little story for a reader not already well acquainted with the period. No doubt the

author was conscious of this, inasmuch as he disclaims any intention to write a text for classroom use; but a student, if he has first read a normal factual history, would benefit greatly by perusing this interpretive work. Of course no one is likely to agree with all Dr. Read's judgments. Why, for example, does he say that Elizabeth had treated Mary Queen of Scots abominably? On the whole, it would seem that the English queen had twice saved or prolonged her Scottish rival's life, first by refusing to hand her over to the Scottish Lords of the Congregation and then by ignoring for nearly twenty years the persistent demands of her English subjects for Mary's execution. Has the closing scene of Mary's life so completely commended her to the sympathy of later generations? Comparing her execution with that of Charles I, the latter gains immensely by the simplicity and sincerity of his conduct compared with Mary's rather theatrical and ostentatious striving for the halo of martyrdom. GODFREY DAVIES.

*The Enchanted Glass: the Elizabethan Mind in Literature.* By HARDIN CRAIG. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1936, pp. ix, 293, $2.50.) The title of this book is taken from a passage in *The Advancement of Learning* in which Bacon contrasts the mind of man with "a clear and equal glass, wherein the beams of things should reflect according to their true incidence" and likens it to "an enchanted glass, full of superstition and imposture, if it be not delivered and reduced". The author, a professor of English at Stanford University, seeks to penetrate beyond Elizabethan literature to the mind which it expressed, to expound the content of "the enchanted glass" in a particular historical epoch. He addresses himself primarily to students of literature, but he has written an essay in historical mindedness from which students of history in general, assailed by the subtly flattering doctrine that knowledge of the past is useful only as a means of clarifying the present, could profit greatly. They might ponder over such remarks as these: "We . . . have been born into an age whose importance to us makes other ages inconsiderable . . . we have said to the writers of earlier times, 'We will listen to you only in so far as you talk to us about ourselves'. . . . One would not question the right of every age . . . to re-read the classics, including Shakespeare, anew in the light of the view of human existence entertained in that age. Nevertheless, we may express the belief that Shakespeare's meaning, in so far as one can recapture it, is the greatest of all meanings and that, by thinking as far as possible as Shakespeare thought and feeling as he felt, one may appreciate his work more truly, deeply, and profitably than by any other critical approach whatever."

*Marie de l'Incarnation: Écrits spirituels et historiques.* Edited by DOM ALBERT JAMET. Tome III. (Paris, Desclée-De Brouwer, 1935, pp. 417.) The correspondence of Marie of the Incarnation, such as it has come to us through the edition of 1681 by Dom Claude Martin, really begins with the spring of 1635 and continues until the end of 1671, shortly before her death. The present volume gives us sixty-six letters written during the years of her immediate preparation for the mission, 1635-1639, and almost as many more penned during the first five years of her sojourn in Canada. Many are transcribed in their entirety, others in part; they are all accompanied by notes explanatory of minutest details. The letters written from the Canadian mission have as their setting and subject matter the struggles of the early missionaries and colonists. After the brief English domination of the St. Lawrence country, 1629-1632, a few hundred Frenchmen returned to settle a narrow band of land stretching along the river from Quebec to Three Rivers. Montreal was not to be founded until 1642. With the half-

civilized Algonquins and Hurons as their allies in a war to the death with the Iroquois, this pioneer band strove to permeate the region with French politics and the Catholic faith. The historian interested in the foundation of New France will find much interesting information in the writings of the saintly Ursuline of Tours. They are edited very creditably, and the work is well printed and illustrated. FULTON J. SHEEN.

*Carteret, the Brilliant Failure of the Eighteenth Century.* By W. BARING PEMBERTON. (New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1936, pp. xv, 353, $5.00.) Mr. Pemberton is convinced that it is impossible to write a really good life of Carteret and that this is why Archibald Ballantyne failed to do so in his biography published some forty years ago. After consulting the obvious sources of information, he undertakes to "outline Carteret in the foreground of the crowded and brilliant canvas of the eighteenth century". If Carteret does not survive as a heroic or essential figure in the history of his country, perhaps he does not deserve to do so. Indeed, this is substantially Mr. Pemberton's verdict. A disciple of Stanhope, Carteret felt that he had a flair for foreign policy. He discovered to his chagrin that it was not enough to please the king and to be convinced at the moment of the soundness of his own views, but that one who would shape British foreign policy must somehow win and keep the support of the ruling class at home. Walpole and Newcastle had skills in that art he never acquired. Consequently he had ample leisure for his second passion, the bottle, until he learned late in life that his voice would be welcomed at the council table if he would acquiesce in the leadership of those who applied themselves to the task of winning the right to govern the country. Thereafter he was lord president as long as he desired to be. Mr. Pemberton's book adds little that is novel, but his judgment is sounder, and he is better informed concerning the subject and more critical in his conclusions than was Ballantyne. But the "vigorous style" which the publishers attribute to the author is not enhanced by such passages as the description of Queen Anne as "an obese and rather stupid old lady more fitted by nature for the farmstead than the palace" or of Dubois as "the goat-faced Cardinal". W. T. LAPRADE.

*English Constitutional Documents since 1832.* Edited by EUGENE MORROW VIOLETTE. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1936, pp. xi, 226, $2.00.) This collection is intended to supplement Adams and Stephens's *Select Documents*, long well known to teachers and students of English constitutional history. In that compilation, which begins with the Norman Conquest and ends with 1885, a very small proportion of the documents comes from the years after 1832. In the present volume considerably more than half of the space is given to the period since 1885, and most of the documents chosen from it are not accessible in other source books. In all there are 116 selections, and, with the exception of some half dozen, all of them are taken from the statute book. Most of the various classes of documents with which recent English constitutional history is concerned are not represented. Thus no illustrations are given of judicial decisions, orders in council and other forms of delegated legislation, and administrative adjudication. Legislation of an imperial character is explicitly excluded. The documents are arranged in chronological sequence, without regard to subject matter and without editorial explanation or comment. There is no index.

*England, 1870-1914.* By R. C. K. ENSOR. [The Oxford History of England, edited by G. N. Clark.] (New York, Oxford University Press, pp. xxiii, 634, $6.00.) This is the last volume of the projected "Oxford History of England", although

it is the second volume actually published. The fundamental plan of this new co-operative enterprise is to rewrite the history of Britain in the light of the new as well as the old documentary evidence, the work being done by specialists in their respective fields. This is the opportune time for a reconsideration of British history from 1870 to the outbreak of the World War, because such new source material as the *British Documents* by Gooch and Temperley and the lives of Lord Salisbury, Chamberlain, Asquith, Redmond, and Lord Carnarvon, and the unprinted Gladstone Papers are available. Mr. Ensor took advantage of all information these materials afford and hence offers a richer interpretation of this complex period in British history. The volume treats adequately the political and diplomatic history, with the narrative pivoting about England's great statesmen, such as Gladstone, Disraeli, Parnell, Salisbury, Chamberlain, and others. An equal amount of space is devoted to the economic, industrial, social, and cultural aspects of this period of British history. The author's literary style is most engaging. The fact that the book is encyclopedic as to information does not detract from its readability. One of its many valuable features is an up-to-date, extensive, critical bibliography, which all specialists in the field should be happy to find. An elaborate index and several clear, line-cut maps conclude this excellent volume. J. H. LANDMAN.

*The Anvil of War: Letters between F. S. Oliver and his Brother, 1914-1918.* Edited by STEPHEN GWYNN. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1936, pp. vii, 351, $5.50.) The editor says that his purpose was "to make accessible Oliver's judgments on the political conduct of the war". The reader who expects to find here something peculiarly illuminating and penetrating will be disappointed. What he will find is the point of view of an honest, intelligent, patriotic Tory, whose ideals of efficiency gave him a peculiar exasperation with politicians and with the kind of decisions which they have to make, plus a marked tendency to assume that Liberal politicians are extraordinarily cowardly and contemptible. This is not new. There is also throughout a strong bias growing out of the Ulster controversy. Sir Edward Carson is much of a hero to Oliver, his choice for prime minister in 1915. General Gough of Curragh fame, later commander of the ill-fated Fifth Army, was his preference for commander in chief. Sir Henry Wilson, an intimate friend, was, in Oliver's opinion, one of the four Englishmen most responsible for victory. Particularly interesting is the record of a Tory's conversion to admiration for Lloyd George, "the only great personality among the Allies". Occasional musings on general trends provide reflections like the following. "What is going to happen to us all and the world after this war is over?—It seems to me that it depends very much on guidance—on what Carlyle called 'Kingship'. If we are lucky enough to fall upon someone who can and will rule, either by his ideas, or by himself wielding the power of the State—I think that it will be a better world than it has ever been, and we shall all be better people." Would not Herr Hitler recognize this as a formulation of *Das Führerprinzip?* RICHARD A. NEWHALL.

ARTICLES

M. M. KNAPPEN. William Tindale—First English Puritan. *Church Hist.*, Sept.

D. L. KEIR. The Case of Ship-Money. *Law Quar. Rev.*, Oct.

E. J. S. PARSONS. Some Proclamations of Charles I: being Addenda to *Bibliotheca Lindesiana.* Suppl. *Bodleian Quar. Rec.*, VIII, no. 90.

LYDIA M. MARSHALL. The Levying of the Hearth Tax, 1662-1688. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

A. GOODWIN. Wood's Halfpence. *Ibid.*

CHARLES F. MULLETT. The English Plague Scare of 1720-23. *Osiris*, Nov.

W. R. SCOTT. New Light on Adam Smith. *Ec. Jour.*, Sept.

MARJORIE NICOLSON. Thomas Paine, Edward Nares, and Mrs. Piozzi's Marginalia. *Huntington Library Bull.*, Oct.

NORMAN MACDONALD. Hemp and Imperial Defence. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, Dec.

ARTHUR S. MORTON. The North West Company's Columbian Enterprise and David Thompson. *Ibid.*, Sept.

W. M. STEWART. David Thompson's Surveys in the North-West. *Ibid.*

E. C. KYTE. Fort Niagara in the War of 1812: Side-Lights from an Unpublished Order-Book. *Ibid.*, Dec.

ISHWAR SAHAI. The Educational Reform of Lord William Bentinck. *Jour. Indian Hist.*, Apr.

G. H. BOLSOVER. David Urquhart and the Eastern Question, 1833-37: a Study in Publicity and Diplomacy. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Dec.

LÉO-PAUL DESROSIERS. Au temps de Durham: La Maison divisée sur elle-même. *Can. Fr.*, Oct.

ÉLIE HALÉVY. Palmerston et Guizot, 1846-1848. *Rev. Sci. Pol.*, July.

GEORGE F. G. STANLEY. The Half-Breed "Rising" of 1875. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, Dec.

J. B. FORT. Les idées de Samuel Butler. *Rev. Philos.*, Sept.

RAYMOND BEAZLEY. Britain, Germany, and the Portuguese Colonies, 1898-99. *Berl. Monatsh.*, Nov.

H. A. INNIS. More Books on the Canadian Far North [review article]. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, Dec.

HAROLD P. JOHNS, ed. British Columbia's Appeal to Sir Wilfrid Laurier for Better Terms. *Ibid.*

HANS HALLMANN. Delcassés letzter Kampf um die Macht und die englischen "Angebote" vom Frühjahr 1905. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, 1936, no. 3.

H. R. G. GREAVES. L'Angleterre reactionnaire. *Rev. Sci. Pol.*, July.

RAJANI KANTA DAS. The Rise of Labour Legislation in India. *Asiatic Quar.*, Oct.

DOCUMENTS

The Appeal of the North West Company to the British Government to forestall John Jacob Astor's Columbian Enterprise. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, Sept.

GAVIN B. HENDERSON. Some Unpublished Documents from the Royal Archives, Windsor. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Dec.

## FRANCE, BELGIUM, THE NETHERLANDS

*H. E. Bourne and A. Hyma*

*Histoire de la politique extérieure de la France, 806-1936.* By LOUIS PAUL DESCHANEL. (Paris, Payot, 1936, pp. 284, 24 fr.) We now have a comprehensive view of French foreign policy from the bearer of a distinguished name in French literature and politics and with a preface by Wladimir d'Ormesson. The period of the Middle Ages is treated in a single chapter, so that the subject of the volume is actually French foreign policy in the modern period. It is perhaps indicative of the attitude of the author that apropos of the outbreak of the World War Germany is accused of having decided "à saisir le premier motif de déclencher ce conflit auquel elle se prépare depuis dix ans".

*Les nouveaux horizons de la Renaissance française.* By GEOFFROY ATKINSON. (Paris, Librairie E. Droz, 1935, pp. xix, 502, 40 fr.) The title of this book will be adequately descriptive to those who are familiar with the author's four previous publications on geographical travel and lore in French literature, beginning with *The Extraordinary Voyage in French Literature before 1700* (1920) and ending with *La littérature géographique française de la Renaissance: Ré-*

*pertoire bibliographique* (1927). Others might have been helped by the insertion of the word *géographiques* in the title. The new book exploits the writings listed in the 1927 volume and some thirty others discovered in the course of more than a solid year spent in European and American libraries in a systematic reading of them all. The author disclaims any intention to attempt any broad *kulturgeschichtliche* interpretation of the influence of these writings upon the currents of French thought (p. 49); his purpose is more modest. The book is organized in two parts. In the first, entitled "La littérature géographique", he prints some hundreds of excerpts from the literature, grouped in chapters. The excerpts are introduced by and imbedded in a cautious, sound commentary. In the second part of the volume, with a similar method and in the main identical chapter headings, Professor Atkinson studies the influence of the new ideas upon the great French writers of the period surveyed. The book has a triple index—"Les idées", "Pays-peuples-villes", "Personnes-ordres-partis-livres", and a bibliographical appendix listing chronologically the five hundred and fifty odd primary writings. The learned and industrious professor of Romance languages at Amherst deserves well of historians of the sixteenth century. G. C. SELLERY.

*Ubbo Emmius en Oost-Friesland.* By Dr. J. J. BOER. (Groningen, J. B. Wolters, 1936, pp. vi, 233, 3 fl. 90.) This book is much more important than the title seems to indicate. The present insignificance of the Dutch province of Friesland and of the little corner in the extreme northwest of Germany called East Friesland is likely to mislead the modern reader in this country. But at the opening of the seventeenth century the political theories developed in East Friesland, together with the extraordinary prosperity of the city of Emden, which was one of the leading ports in Europe, made the county of East Friesland the most important neighbor of the Dutch Republic on the Continent. In Friesland proper was situated the University of Franeker, now extinct, but a very flourishing center of Calvinistic theology in the first two decades of the seventeenth century. The first president of Harvard and many other prominent figures in the history of England and New England were alumni of Franeker. Ubbo Emmius was for eight years a Calvinistic preacher at Norden in East Friesland, 1579-1587, and for twenty years at Groningen in the Netherlands. He became the founder of the University of Groningen and its first *rector magnificus.* His biography is charmingly told in the work under discussion, which also presents an excellent analysis of his writings and his theories on government and religion.

*Correspondance de la cour d'Espagne sur les affaires des Pays-Bas au XVII^e siècle.* Tome V, *Précis de la correspondance de Charles II, 1665-1700.* By JOSEPH CUVELIER with the collaboration of JOSEPH LEFÈVRE. [Académie royale de Belgique, Commission royale d'histoire.] (Brussels, Maurice Lamertin, 1935, pp. xxv, 796.) In this volume are calendared 1942 documents from the archives in Brussels covering the very significant period from 1665 to 1700. The southern Netherlands became the arena of the wars between Louis XIV and his enemies, were dismembered politically, and ruined economically. Although only brief digests of the documents are presented, the reader will profit greatly from them; in fact this and the preceding volumes of the series are indispensable for every serious student of the seventeenth century. H. S. LUCAS.

*Cahiers de la Révolution française.* No. V, *La Révolution française et l'Amérique latine.* By HUGO D. BARBAGELATA. (Paris, Sirey, 1936, pp. 84, 10 fr.) The "Centre d'Études" at the University of Paris dealing with the French Revolution has added this to its series of cahiers.

*Avec Brazza: Souvenirs de la mission de l'Ouest-Africain, mars 1883-janvier 1886.* By CH. DE CHAVANNES. [Les origines de l'Afrique équatoriale française.] (Paris, Librairie Plon, 1935, pp. 380, 30 fr.) Charles de Chavannes was Brazza's secretary and loyal lieutenant. It was he who built Brazzaville on the northern shore of Stanley Pool. Indeed, this book, which is based upon his diary, is largely an account of his own work at this post during Brazza's absence. Following his chief's example, he relied upon patience, kindness, gifts of trinkets and of food to retain the loyalty of Makoko, the most powerful native potentate north of the Congo, and that of his vassals to the treaty of October 3, 1880, which the French parliament had ratified two years later. With Stanley, Chavannes had no contact, but he had constantly to guard against the efforts of certain officials of the International Association of the Congo at Leopoldville across the Pool to seduce the natives under French protection. On the approach of and during the Conference of Berlin this competition increased, but the results of the mission were largely assured in the separate agreement between France and the Congo Free State. The book closes with the return to France, just as the joint commission arrived for the delimitation of the frontiers. Its interest is augmented by the author's keen eye for native customs, by his own sketches of native chiefs and scenes, and by a detailed report in the appendixes of an important *palabre* with the tribal authorities. An excellent map increases its usefulness as a source for the origins of French Equatorial Africa and for the partition of the Congo Basin.

E. MALCOLM CARROLL.

ARTICLES

ALBERT HYMA. Erasmus and the Oxford Reformers. *Bijdr. Vaderland. Gesch. Oudh.*, 1936, nos. 3-4.

O. NOORDENBOS. Erasmus en de Nederlanden. *Ibid.*

W. KÖHLER. Erasmus von Rotterdam als religiöse Persönlichkeit. *Ibid.*

A. RENAUDET. La critique érasmienne et l'humanisme français. *Ibid.*

BENJAMIN H. UNRUH. Dutch Backgrounds of the Mennonite Migration of the 16th Century to Prussia. *Mennonite Quar. Rev.*, July.

JOHN U. NEF. A Comparison of Industrial Growth in France and England from 1540 to 1640 [cont.]. *Jour. Pol Ec.*, Oct.

GHISLAINE DE BOOM. Un projet d'alliance entre Charles-Quint et François I^er^ négocié par Louise de Savoie et Marguerite d'Autriche. *Rev. Hist. Mod.*, May.

PAULINA HAVELAAR. Marnix van St. Aldegonde als verdediger van Antwerpen 1584-1585. *Bijdr. Vaderland. Gesch. Oudh.*, 1936, nos. 1-2.

J. STEUR. Archivisten in dienst van het Vereenigde Koninkrijk: III, Gachard [cont.]. *Ned. Arch.*, 1936, no. 3.

P. VERHAEGEN. Trois siècles retracés par les membres de la famille Spoelbergh à Louvain. *Rev. Hist. Eccles.*, July.

W. E. VAN DAM VAN ISSELT. Onze Grens- en Kustdekking. *Haagsch Maandh.*, Oct.

A. J. W. RENAUD. Devaluatie: Geen Vraagstuk, doch een Onvermijdelijkheid. *Ibid.*, Sept.

PIERRE DEJEAN. L'exportation des vins béarnais dans les pays du Nord au XVII^e^ siècle. *Rev. Hist. Mod.*, May.

H. CHAVANE DE DALMASSY. Les français de Maranhao. *Rev. Ques. Hist.*, Sept.

PHILIPPE SAGNAC. Les limites de la France et la théorie des frontières naturelles du XVII^e^ au XX^e^ siècle. *Franco-Am. Rev.*, Autumn.

BERNARD FAŸ. Portrait du comte de Vergennes. *Ibid.*

DENISE AIMÉ. Vergennes: Essai de bibliographie historique et critique. *Ibid.*

L. LECLÈRE. La Révolution française et la recherche de la vérité historique. *Acad. Roy. Belg., Bull. Class. Lett.*, 1936, no. 5.

MARCEL MARION. Un révolutionnaire très conservateur: Creuzé-Latouche. *Rev. Hist. Mod.*, Mar.

SHEPARD B. CLOUGH. Esquisse d'un projet pour une histoire de l'économie nationale de la France depuis 1789. *Ibid.*

EDOUARD HERRIOT. Fouché et Robespierre. *Rév. Fr., Rev. Hist. Cont.*, 1936, no. 3.

E. MIRKINE-GUETZÉVITCH. L'abbé Sieyès. *Ibid.*

FERNAND DEHOUSSE. Notes sur l'histoire diplomatique de l'Escaut de 1789 à 1815. *Ibid.*

GÉNÉRAL HERLAUT. La querelle de Bouchotte et de Custine. *An. Hist. Rév. Fr.*, Sept.

SHELBY T. MCCLOY. Charity Workshops during the French Revolution. *South Atlantic Quar.*, Oct.

LOUIS MADELIN. L'ascension de Bonaparte [cont.]. *Rev. Deux Mondes*, Oct. 1.

ÉMILE DARD. Un ami de Talleyrand: Le duc de Dalberg. *Rev. Paris*, Aug. 15.

CARL LUDWIG LOKKE. The French Agricultural Mission to Egypt in 1801. *Agricultural Hist.*, July.

PAOLO TREVES. Joseph de Maistre [cont.]. *N. Riv. Stor.*, 1936, nos. 3-4.

ADOLFO OMODEO. Cattolicismo e civiltà moderna nel secolo XIX: I, J. de Maistre [cont.]. *Critica*, Nov.

RAYMOND DECARY. Sylvain Roux et le serment des peuples de Tanibé à Madagascar en 1822. *Rev. Hist. Col.*, 1936, no. 3.

PAUL DUDON. Disciples et admirateurs florentins de Lamennais. *Rev. Ques. Hist.*, Sept.

ANDRÉ LEFÈVRE. La circulation routière dans l'Est au début de la Restauration. *An. Est*, 1936, no. 3.

N. JORGA. La France dans le Sud-Est de l'Europe (conférences en Sorbonne, III, IV). *Rev. Hist. Sud-Est Européen*, Apr.

MARCEL EMERIT. Une mystification: Les mémoires du baron d'Ambès. *Rev. Hist. Mod.*, May.

VICTOR AUGUST WROBLEWSKI. Der Boulangismus im Lichte russischer Berichterstattung. *Berl. Monatsh.*, Aug.

H. HALLMANN. Delcassé's letzten Kampf um die Macht und die englischen "Angebot" von Frühjahr 1905. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, Sept.

B. C[ROCE]. Giorgio Sorel e il liberalismo. *Critica*, Sept.

ADOLF HASENCLEVER. Zur Geschichte der spanischen-französischen Beziehungen vor Ausbruch des Weltkrieges. *Berl. Monatsh.*, Sept.

CH. APPUHN. Alliés et adversaires de la France d'après les documents français relatifs aux origines de la guerre (3e série). *Rev. Hist. Mod.*, Mar.

DOCUMENTS

JACQUES PANNIER, ed. Français du Sud-Ouest étudiants à Glasgow. *Bull. Soc. Hist. Prot. Fr.*, Apr.

CHARLES CHESNELONG. Correspondance inédite de Charles Chesnelong, 1865-1870: Notes inédites de Raymond Larrabuse (décembre 1870). *Rev. Ques. Hist.*, Sept.

MAURICE TOUSSAINT, ed. Lettres de Christian Pfister à Camille Jullian [cont.]. *An. Est*, 1936, no. 3.

ALBERT ÉMILE SOREL, ed. Albert Sorel et Albert Eynaud: Lettres à Albert Eynaud [cont.]. *Rev. Deux Mondes*, Nov. 1.

## GERMANY, AUSTRIA, HUNGARY, SWITZERLAND

*E. N. Anderson*

*Wilhelm I., Kaiserfrage, und Kölner Dom: Ein biographischer Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Reichsgründung.* By KARL HAMPE. (Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1936, pp. 183.) This essay handles a neat problem in source criticism. The author discovered in the archive of the ministry of foreign affairs in Brussels an undated and unsigned dispatch from the Belgian minister at The Hague to his home government recounting a conversation with Crown Prince Humbert of Italy. The crown prince said that in the previous year (1867) King William of Prussia had declared to him that "il [King William] pressait

l'achèvement de la Cathédrale de Cologne afin de s'y faire sacrer Empéreur d'Allemagne" (p. 177). Since this statement runs contrary to the accepted story of William's attitude toward German unification, the author had to survey once more the materials on this point. His analysis of them for the period 1848 to 1871 confirms the accuracy of Crown Prince Humbert's remark and definitely destroys the legend that William I was loath to assume the title of emperor. William eagerly desired the position and always had, but on his own terms. When in 1870-1871 he confronted reality, he would have blundered if Bismarck had not forced him into line. William wanted the title to be Emperor of Germany, not German Emperor; he wished to preserve his Prussian title on a par with the new one; he wished the new dignity to be offered him by the German rulers; he disliked intensely the thought of the German people or their representatives having any part in the formal establishment of the position. The second part of the problem deals with the reference in the king's assertion to the Cologne Cathedral. The author's conclusions on this point are as interesting as those on the other and more important one. They cannot be summarized here, however. Professor Hampe's investigation is done with neat precision and entire conviction. It adds another chapter to the history of the mistakes which King William would have made had it not been for Bismarck.

*The New Germany: National Socialist Government in Theory and Practice.* By FRITZ ERMARTH. With an Introduction by Ernest S. Griffith. [American University Studies in International Law and Relations.] (Washington, Digest Press, 1936, pp. xv, 203, $2.00.) This book is disappointing. The author believes that "a process of social evolution had undermined democracy before Hitler's advent to power and had rendered the 'totalitarian' state a necessity". This "necessity", however, is not so much the result of the abnormal situation in which Germany found itself since the war but is due to inherent contradictions in capitalist development. "Capitalism created the political form of liberal democracy", writes Dr. Ermarth; "the development of capitalism now required the replacement of liberal democracy by a new type of state". Unfortunately, the evidence produced to support this not too original thesis is utterly inadequate. The two chapters on "The Constitutional Structure" and "The Economic State", which form the bulk of Dr. Ermarth's volume, contain no information that has not been already presented to the English-speaking public. The short closing chapter on "The Future of the Totalitarian State" is, by comparison, readable and refreshing, even if one may be permitted to question the soundness of his belief in the important role the army is to play in deciding the fate of Germany. It must be pointed out to Dr. Ermarth's credit that his facts are usually correct and his volume free from the spirit of righteous denunciation of the Hitler rule so common in current books on Germany. Radical-minded readers will find some consolation in the author's belief that the redistribution of wealth is the fundamental problem facing National Socialism and that on its solution depends, in the last analysis, the future of the Third Reich. How the redistribution of wealth will assist Germany in tackling her pressing and momentous economic difficulties remains unexplained. MICHAEL T. FLORINSKY.

ARTICLES

MAX HORCKHEIMER. Egoismus und Freiheitsbewegung: Zur Anthropologie des bürgerlichen Zeitalters. *Zeitsch. f. Sozialf.*, Sept.

ALBERT CLOS. Zur näheren Bestimmung der Abfassungszeit von Luthers Schrift "Wider die räuberischen und mörderischen Rotten der Bauern, 1525". *Arch. f. Reformationsgesch.*, 1936, nos. 129-130.

KURT UHRIG. Der Bauer in der Publizistik der Reformation bis zum Ausgang des Bauernkriegs [cont.]. *Ibid.*

ERNST HIRSCH. Die Erfindung des böhmischen Kristalglases. *Mitteil. Vereins f. Gesch. der Deutschen in Böhmen.* 1936, nos. 1-2.

ARNOLD BERNEY. Französische Bemühungen um den Kronprinzen Friedrich, 1732-38. *Arch. f. Kulturgesch.*, 1935, no. 1.

M. WUNDT. Die deutsche Philosophie im Zeitalter der Aufklärung. *Zeitsch. f. Deutsche Kulturphilos.*, 1936, no. 3.

H. BRUNSCHWIG. La lutte de l'Aufklärung contre les orthodoxes juifs en Prusse à la fin du XVIII[e] siècle. *An. Hist. Rév. Fr.*, Sept.

HELMUTH ECKERT. Neues zur Characteristik Gaudis und seines Journals. *Forsch. z. Brandenburg. und Preuss. Gesch.*, 1936, no. 2.

KARL WOLFF. Individuum und Gemeinschaft bei Adam Müller. *Hist. Vierteljahr.*, Oct.

HELMUTH KRETZSCHMAR. Wilhelm Krügers Tätigkeit im Generalgouvernement, 1813-15. *Forschungen*, 1936, no. 2.

JUSTUS HASHAGEN. Der Rhythmus im Wandel von Reaktion und Revolution, 1815-52. *Hist. Vierteljahr.*, July.

EDGAR FLEIG. Aus der konservativen Gedankenwelt eines Restaurationspolitikers. *Hist. Jahrb.*, 1936, no. 3.

ERICH BRANDENBURG. Deutsche Einheit. *Hist. Vierteljahr.*, July.

VEIT VALENTIN. Y a-t-il des lois dans la politique extérieure de Bismarck? *Rev. Hist.*, July.

CARL DEMETER. Aus dem Kreis um Bismarck im Frankfurt a/M Tagebücher. *Forschungen*, 1936, no. 2.

JUSTUS HASHAGEN. Ranke's Hinwendung zu Preussen. *Ibid.*

WOLFGANG HALLGARTEN. L'essor et l'échec de la politique boer de l'Allemagne, 1890-1898. *Rev. Hist.*, May.

JOVAN M. JOVANOCIĆ. Hat Österreich-Ungarn gewusst? Die angebliche Mitwisserschaft der österreichisch-ungarischen Regierung an der Verschwörung gegen König Alexander von Serbien 1903. *Berl. Monatsh.*, Oct.

ERNST ANRICH. Die deutsche Politik in der ersten Marokkokrise. *Hist. Vierteljahr.*, July.

ARNO KOSELLECK. Die Entfaltung des volkischen Bewusstseins bei Paul de Lagarde. *Ibid.*, Oct.

ERNST LASLOWSKI. Diltheys Verhältnis zur geschichtlichen Welt. *Hist. Jahrb.*, 1936, no. 3.

GUSTAV ROLOFF. Zur Mission Liman von Sanders. *Berl. Monatsh.*, Oct.

KARL JELUSIC. La noblesse autrichienne: Avant et après la guerre. *An. Hist. Ec. et Soc.*, July.

ARNO MEHLAN. Das deutsch-bulgarische Weltkriegsbündnis. *Hist. Vierteljahr.*, Oct.

KARL VON MACCHIO. Momentbilder aus der Julikrise 1914. *Berl. Monatsh.*, Oct.

EMIL RATZENHOFER. Die Festsetzung der ersten Mobilisierungstage in Österreich-Ungarn im Sommer 1914. *Ibid.*

GERHARD ALBRECHT. Soziale Probleme und Sozialpolitik in Deutschland während des Weltkrieges. 2. Verhaltnis von Arbeiterschaft und Unternehmerschaft. *Jahrb. f. Nationalökon. und Statis.*, Aug.

W. J. ROSE. The Poles of Germany. *Slav. and East Europ. Rev.*, July.

I. F. D. MORROW. The Prussianization of the Poles. *Ibid.*

X. Y. Z. Russo-German Relations since the War. *Ibid.*

TIBOR BARATH. L'histoire en Hongrie, 1867-1935 [bibliographical article]. *Rev. Hist.*, July.

M. W. FODOR. The Austrian Roots of Hitlerism. *For. Affairs*, July.

JOSEPH REDLICH. German Austria and Nazi Germany. *Ibid.*

### DOCUMENTS

ELSE BRÖKELSCHEN-KEMPER. Ein unbekannter Brief Königin Luise. *Forschungen*, 1936, no. 2.

## Italy

*Gaudens Megaro*

### Articles

Gabriel Maugain. L'humanisme italien en France avant 1515. *Rev. Études Ital.*, Apr.

Jean Baillou. L'influence de la pensée philosophique de la Renaissance italienne sur la pensée française: État présent des travaux relatifs au XVI^e siècle. *Ibid.*

René Pintard. *Ibid.*: État des travaux relatifs au XVII^e siècle. *Ibid.*

G. N. Giordano-Orsini. Machiavelli's Discourses: A Manuscript Translation of 1599. (London) *Times Lit. Suppl.*, Oct. 10.

Carlo Morandi. La fine del dominio spagnuolo in Lombardia e le premesse storiche delle riforme settecentesche. *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 1936, no. 2.

Agostino Faggiotto. Giulio Cesare Cordara e Papa Clemente XIV. *Atti R. Ist. Veneto Sci., Lett., Arti*, XCV, pt. 2, no. 1.

Ottorino Montenovesi. La malattia e la morte del Papa Clemente XIV. *Rass. Nazionale*, June.

Heinz Holldack. Die Neutralitätspolitik Leopolds von Toskana. *Hist. Vierteljahrschr.*, 1936, no. 4.

Giulio Natali. Pasquale Paoli nella letteratura italiana del settecento. *Arch. Stor. Corsica*, July.

Heinz Holldack. Victor Hehn und Ferdinand Gregorovius: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Italienauffasung. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, 1936, no. 2.

Carlo Zaghi. In margine alla campagna napoleonica del 1812: Italiani prigionieri in Russia. *Rass. Stor. Risorgimento*, July.

Nello Rosselli. La politica inglese in Italia nell'età del Risorgimento. *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, June.

Achille De Rubertis. Gian Domenico Romagnosi giudicato da un censore granducale. *N. Riv. Stor.*, May.

Georges Bourgin. Sources et travaux français sur l'histoire des rapports franco-italiens de 1830 à 1848. *Rev. Études Ital.*, Apr.

Henri Bédarida. Relations et échanges intellectuels entre la France et l'Italie de 1830 à 1848: État des travaux, programme de recherches. *Ibid.*

Benjamin Crémieux. L'émigration politique italienne en France sous la Monarchie de Juillet. *Ibid.*

S. Camugli. Les événements de la Monarchie de Juillet et leurs répercussions italiennes vus à travers les sonnets en dialecte romain de G. G. Belli. *Ibid.*

C. Vidal. Un italien, ambassadeur de France à Rome, Pellegrino Rossi, 1844-1848. *Ibid.*

Pietro Silva. La politica francese in Italia nell'epoca delle riforme, 1846-1848, e l'accordo Metternich-Guizot. *Ibid.*

Leonardo Mordini. Un tentativo di arruolamento in Corsica per la Sicilia nel 1848-49. *Arch. Stor. Corsica*, July.

Carlo Morandi. La formazione culturale e politica di Cesare Correnti. *Annali Sci. Polit.*, June.

Riccardo Bachi. La crisi economica del 1853-54 nel regno di Sardegna: Contributo alla storia economica del Risorgimento. *Riv. Stor. Ec.*, June.

A. Omodeo. La formazione di una leggenda cavouriana. *Critica*, Sept.

B. C[roce]. La strana vita di un tedesco capo di briganti nell' Italia meridionale e giornalista anticlericale in Austria: L. R. Zimmerman. *Ibid.*, July.

Giuseppina Farinelli. Alcuni cenni sull'opera politica di Agostino Bertani. *Rass. Nazionale*, Feb.

C. Vidal. Gli studi francesi sul Risorgimento: periodo 1870-1915. *Rass. Stor. Risorgimento*, Aug.

Ernesto Buonaiuti. Il cardinale Pietro Gasparri. *Politica*, Feb.

J. L. Glanville. A Crisis in Italian Colonial Opinion. *Southwest Soc. Sci. Quar.*, June.

Eugenio Passamonti. Preliminari diplomatici all'accordo tripartito per l'Etiopia del 1906. *N. Riv. Stor.*, May.

Leo Wollemborg. L'Italia, gli alleati e la politica di guerra nell' Oriente prossimo, 1915-1917. *Rass. Stor. Risorgimento*, July.

Luigi Sturzo. Experiences and Reflections. *Dublin Rev.*, July.

[Count Carlo] Sforza. Italians and Yugoslavs. *Contemp. Rev.*, Sept.

Roberto Marvasi. Souvenirs du temps de la marche sur Rome. *Europe*, Sept.

Herbert L. Stewart. Machiavelli and Fascism. *Univ. Toronto Quar.*, Oct.

Pietro Badoglio. Sintesi della guerra italo-etiopica. *N. Antol.*, Sept. 1.

Emilio De Bono. Dal Mareb a Makallè. *Ibid.*, Oct. 16.

Gaetano Salvemini. Il vaticano e la guerra etiopica. *Giustizia e Libertà* [Paris weekly]. Sept. 18-Nov. 20.

Documents

Guglielmo Guariglia, ed. La corrispondenza di Carlo Bascapè a S. Carlo Borromeo nella collezione della Biblioteca Ambrosiana. *Aevum*, Apr.

Corrado Zacchetti, ed. Una biografia inedita di Bianca Capello. *Rass. Ital.*, July.

Mario Zucchi, ed. Il cardinale Maurizio di Savoia e l'arcivescovato di Monreale. *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 1936, no. 2.

Romolo Quazza, ed. Una pagina di storia diplomatica franco-sabauda: Da documenti inediti. *Convivium*, May.

Tommaso Sorbelli, ed. L. A. Muratori e la storia delle missioni etiopiche. *Ibid.*

*Id.* Lettere di donne a Lodovico Antonio Muratori. *Ibid.*, July.

Ada Somigliana Zuccolo, ed. Un amico di Giuseppe II, Lodovico Barbiano Conte di Belgioioso: Dalla sua corrispondenza inedita. *Arch. Stor. Lombardo*, Apr.

Mario Battistini, ed. Documenti italiani nel Belgio: La corrispondenza del Conte Ilarione Petitti di Roreto con Adolfo Quetelet. *Rass. Stor. Risorgimento*, Aug.

Vittorio Cian, ed. Vincenzo Gioberti e l'on. abate Giovanni Napoleone Monti: Da lettere inedite [concl.]. *Ibid.*, July.

Ersilio Michel, ed. Documenti relativi al mancato viaggio in Francia di Pio IX, 1848-1849. *Ibid.*

Emilia Morelli, ed. Giuseppe Mazzini e Antonio Gallenga. *Vita Ital.*, July.

Mario Puccioni, ed. Ricercando negli archivi del ministero dell' interno della Toscana avanti e dopo il 27 aprile 1859. *Rass. Stor. Risorgimento*, Aug.

Alessandro Guiccioli. Diario del 1881, 1882. *N. Antol.*, July 16-Sept. 1.

## Russia

*Avrahm Yarmolinsky*

Articles

Miron Korduba. Rozwój i obecny stan badań nad latopisami staroruskiemi [study of Russian chronicles]. *Balticoslavica*, 1936, no. 2.

B. Tikhomirov. K voprosu o genezise i kharaktere immuniteta v feodal'noĭ Rusi [immunity in feudal Russia]. *Istorik-marksist*, 1936, no. 3.

K. V. Bazilevich. Denezhnaya reforma Alekseya Mikhailovicha [monetary reform of Czar Alexis, 1654-1663]. *Bull. Acad. Sci. URSS*, sér. VII, Classe Sci. Soc., 1935, no. 3.

*Id.* Vosstaniye v Moskve v 1662 g. [rebellion in Moscow in 1662]. *Ibid.*, nos. 4-5.

S. Rostovski. Tzarskaya Rossiya i Sinkiang in 19-20 vekakh [Russia and Sinkiang in the 19th and 20th centuries]. *Istorik-marksist*, 1936, no. 3.

Nicholas Golovin. The Russian War Plan of 1914 [cont.]. *Slav. and East Europ. Rev.*, July.

Documents

J. Kuznetzov. Krepostnyye krest'yane sela Barasheva-Usada v pervoi polovine 19 v. [the serfs of the village of Barashev-Usad in the first half of the 19th century]. *Krasnyi Ark.*, 1936, no. 4.

Stroitel'stvo Dneprovskoi verfi v 18 v. [construction of the Kichkas wharf on the Dnieper]. *Ibid.*

A. Yefimov. Posylka dvukh russkikh eskadr v Severnuyu Ameriku [two Russian naval squadrons in North America, 1862-1863]. *Istorik-marksist*, 1936, no. 3.

F. Petrov. Kronshtadtskoye vosstaniye 1906 g. [the Kronstadt rebellion of 1906]. *Krasnyi Ark.*, 1936, no. 4.

NORTHERN EUROPE

*L. M. Larson*

*The Problem of Wineland.* By HALLDÓR HERMANSSON. [Islandica.] (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1936, pp. 84, $1.00.) In this essay the author examines the hypothesis, first advanced by Sofus Larsen in 1919, that sometime in the 1470's the king of Denmark and Norway, acting on a suggestion from Portugal, sent an expedition into the Atlantic which finally reached Newfoundland. Professor Hermansson concludes that Larsen's belief is not supported by sufficient evidence. In this he is in agreement with Egmont Zechlin but in disagreement with A. W. Brögger, R. Hennig, and Theodor Steche, whose articles on this subject are noted elsewhere.

*Karl Johan i den stora koalitionen mot Napoleon.* By TORVALD T:SON HÖJER. (Upsala, 1935, pp. xliv, 423.) In this study the author gives a highly detailed account of Swedish diplomacy in the fateful months following Bernadotte's break with Napoleon in 1812. The narrative is much concerned with the efforts of the new crown prince to secure Norway, but the author has also found it necessary to deal with a number of other questions of greater or lesser moment. Höjer's attitude toward "the adventurer from Gascony" is distinctly critical, though he is willing to grant that Bernadotte was great in the chancery as well as on the battlefield. In diplomatic skill and in lack of scruple he holds him the equal of such masters as Metternich and Alexander I.

*Den svenska utrikesförvaltningens historia.* Edited by O. WIESELGREN. (Upsala, 1935, pp. 548.) This is a history of the Swedish foreign office and an account of the business transacted by this department and its many organs in various parts of the world. The work traverses the entire field of Swedish history from the Middle Ages to the present time; it is a co-operative undertaking to which several of the more prominent Swedish historians have made contributions.

*Sveriges ekonomiska historia från Gustav Vasa.* By ELI F. HECKSCHER. Two volumes. (Stockholm, 1935, 1936, pp. xliii, 784.) This work is an account of economic development in Sweden in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Throughout most of the earlier period economic life in Sweden was dominated by the older medieval ideals, and the author has therefore found it unnecessary to deal with this century in any great detail. In the days of Gustavus Adolphus and his successors, however, the kingdom was coming into constantly closer touch with its neighbors on the Baltic and farther out, receiving quickening impulses from them all, particularly from the Netherlands. The more important part of the study is consequently that which deals with economic progress in the seventeenth century.

*Kancelliets Brevböger vedrörende Danmarks indre Forhold.* Edited by E. MARQUARD. (Copenhagen, 1936, pp. 959.) This is the current volume of an extensive publication of archive materials recently projected by the Danish government. In this case the general subject is the domestic situation in the second quarter of the seventeenth century.

*Staatsraadets Forhandlinger om Danmarks Udenrigspolitik 1863-79.* Edited by AAGE FRIIS. (Copenhagen, 1936, pp. 447.) The editor of this volume has brought together such extracts from the minutes of the ministerial discussions as deal with Danish foreign policy during the period indicated in the title. It serves to illustrate the state and the movement of public sentiment as well as the state of opinion in the king's government in these years of Denmark's

greatest humiliation. The work is an important contribution not only to the body of available printed sources for Danish history but to that of those for general European history as well.

ARTICLES

R. HENNIG. Die These einer vorcolumbischen portugiesischen Geheimkenntniss von Amerika. *Hist. Vierteljahr.*, 1935, no. 3.

EGMONT ZECHLIN. Das Problem der vorkolumbische Entdeckung Amerikas und die Kolumbusforschung. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, 1935, no. 1.

THEODOR STECHE. Die normannischen Fahrten nach Winland und ihre Nachwirkungen. *Zeitsch. f. Deutsche Philol.*, 1935, no. 2.

A. W. BRÖGGER. Vinlandsferdene. *Norsk Geog. Tidsskr.* [Eng. trans., *Am.-Scand. Rev.*, 1936, no. 3.], 1936, no. 2.

POUL NÖRLUND. Gotland paa Valdemarstogets Tid. *Tilskueren*, Sept.

PERCY ELFSTRAND. Svensk historisk bibliografi, 1935. *Hist. Tidskr.*, 1936, no. 3.

## THE FAR EAST

*C. H. Peake*

*Historical and Commercial Atlas of China.* By ALBERT HERRMANN. [Harvard-Yenching Institute Monograph Series.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1935, pp. 112, $5.00.) Few people in the world could have attempted a task of this sort, requiring knowledge of the most diverse type from a wide variety of sources, and carried it off more successfully than Dr. Herrmann, for twenty-five years *Privatdocent* and then professor of historical geography in the University of Berlin. Each of his 118 maps, some of them thumbnail sketches of a city or district, others two pages in size, is supported by special bibliography, including a few Russian, Chinese, and Japanese items; and the most up-to-date (1933-1934) information has generally been utilized. The whole is concluded by an excellent index and a complete list of Chinese characters. It fills a real need, and the Harvard-Yenching Institute is to be congratulated on financing the project and on arranging for such a good job of printing and format. By way of criticism one may ask why the author chose to give us maps for such periods as 1900 B.C. and 1600 B.C. His sources here are only literary fragments of a millenium later, and of not one capital of this time have we any archaeological confirmation. Similarly one may inquire why he elected to use the *Yü-kung* as a basis for China at *ca.* 1110 B.C. when we now have for this century the incontrovertible evidence of remains from Shang levels at Anyang. To skip 3000 years—what of the figure given of 85,000 Chinese emigrants in the West Indies? The figure in the last *Year Book* is 36,400, which seems much more reasonable. There is a Continental trace in the author's English, as in Magalhães for Magellan, but this does not mar the book. A more serious blunder is the inclusion of paper in the map for 100 B.C. I am also surprised that a geographer should repeat the old mistake of equating Chih-fu and Chefoo.

L. CARRINGTON GOODRICH.

ARTICLES

G. B. CRESSEY. Some Recent Chinese Geographical Studies. *Geograph. Rev.*, July.

I. MIYAZAKI. Dokushi Sakki [miscellaneous notes on some problems of Oriental history]. *Shirin*, Jan.

TUNG, TSO-PIN. Wu-teng Chüeh tsai Yin-Shang [the five titles of the feudal system in the Shang dynasty, *ca.* 1766-1122 B.C.]. *Bull. Inst. Hist. and Philol. of the Academia Sinica*, 1936, no. 3.

HERRLEE GLESSNER CREEL. Bronze Inscriptions of the Western Chou Dynasty [*i.e.*, before 770 B.C.] as Historical Documents. *Jour. Am. Oriental Soc.*, Sept.

T'ANG, LANG. Pu-tz'u Shih-tai-ti Wen-hsüeh ho Pu-tz'u Wen-hsüeh [the bone oracle inscriptions and early Chinese literature, *ca.* 1400-1100 B.C.]. *Ch'ing-hua Hsüeh-pao*, July.

KU, CHIEH-KANG and T'UNG SHU-YEH. Han-tai-i-ch'ien Chung-kuo-jen ti Shih-chieh Kuan-nien yü Yü Wai-chiao-t'ung ti Ku-shih [Chinese concept of the world prior to the Han dynasty, before 206 B.C.]. *Yü Kung*, Apr.

NAKAMURA, YASUTAKA. Kodai Keiyaku Ron no Ichihen-ei [an archaic form of contract—the Yomo-tsu Hegui—in Japanese mythology]. *Minzokugaku Kenkyu*, Apr.

T. HIRAOKA. Gotei Honki no Shin-kenkyu [new research on the dynastic annals of the Five Emperors of Szu-Ma Ch'ien's *Shih Chi*]. *Shina Gaku*, Apr.

H. T. LEI. The Rise of the Emperor System in Ancient China. *Chinese Soc. and Pol. Sci. Rev.*, July.

G. B. SANSOM. Early Japanese Law and Administration [cont.]. *Trans. Asiatic Soc. Japan*, 1934 [received 1936].

NIIDA, NOBORU. Shina no Tochi Daicho (Yü Lin Tu T'se) no Shiteki Kenkyu [a Chinese land ledger]. *Tôhô Gakuhô*, Feb.

K. HINO. Sodai no Kiko o Ronjite Koko Mondai ni oyobu [discussion of the problem of falsified family reports and the population statistics of the Sung dynasty]. *Shigaku Zasshi*, Jan.

V. A. RIASANOVSKY. Mongol Law and Chinese Law in the Yuan Dynasty. *Chinese Soc. and Pol. Sci. Rev.*, July.

T. SUZUKI. Chusei no okeru Sotō-Zen no Minshūka Undo [the movement for the popularizing of the Soto-Zen sect of Buddhism in Japan, *ca.* 1200-1600]. *Shigaku Zasshi*, Feb.

K. MAKI. Chusei Makki no okeru Soson Kannen no Sciritsu [the growth of the idea of the community-village in Japan, *ca.* 1400-1600]. *Keizaishi Kenkyu*, July.

PAUL PELLIOT. Encore à propos des voyages de Tcheng Houo. *T'oung Pao*, XXXII, no. 4.

WILLIAM HUNG. K'ao Li Ma-tou ti Shih-chieh Ti-t'u [on the world maps of Matteo Ricci]. *Yü Kung*, Apr.

L. C. GOODRICH. Early New World Influences on China. *China*, Nov.

MENG, SEN. Pa-ch'i Chih-tu K'ao-shih [the origin and development of the Eight Banner military system of the Manchus]. *Bull. Inst. Hist. and Philol. of the Academia Sinica*, 1936, no. 3.

HENRI BERNARD. Les étapes de la cartographie scientifique pour la Chine et les pays voisins, depuis le XVI^e^ jusqu'à la fin du XVIII^e^ siècle. *Monumenta Serica*, I, no. 2.

WALTER FUCHS. Materialien zur Kartographie der Mandju-Zeit. *Ibid.*

SRI RAM SHARMA. Religious Policy of Aurangzeb [cont.]. *Indian Hist. Quar.*, June.

T. KOBAYASHI. Jyū-hachi-seike no France ni okeru Shina-kan-to Sono Kuni Shizōkai ni oyobaseru Shina no Yeikyo [the French view of China in the 18th century and Chinese influence on French thought]. *Shina Gaku*, Apr.

NEIL SKENE SMITH. An Introduction to some Japanese Economic Writings of the Eighteenth Century. *Trans. Asiatic Soc. Japan*, 1934.

E. HONJO. Baku-Matsu Shohan no Kaikoku Shisō [ideas current among various clans with respect to opening the country, *ca.* 1850]. *Keizai Ronso*, Jan.

K. NISHII. Kokumin Kokka Kakuritsu no Ichikatei [the development of the national state in Japan, I]. *Shirin*, July.

HAROLD J. NOBLE. Political Activities of American Missionaries in Korea before 1905. *Nankai Soc. and Ec. Quar.*, July.

OWEN LATTIMORE. The Historical Setting of Inner Mongol Nationalism. *Pacific Affairs*, Sept.

KENNETH COLEGROVE. The Japanese Cabinet. *Am. Pol. Sci. Rev.*, Oct.

MINGE C. BEE. The Peterhof Agreement. *Chinese Soc. and Pol. Sci. Rev.*, July.

THOMAS E. LA FARGUE. The Entrance of China into the World War. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Sept.

WILLIAM J. RONAN. The Kra Canal: a Suez for Japan? *Pacific Affairs*, Sept.

## UNITED STATES HISTORY

*E. C. Burnett*

### General

*Check List of American Laws, Charters, and Constitutions of the 17th and 18th Centuries in the Huntington Library.* Compiled by Willard O. Waters. [Huntington Library Publications.] (San Marino, the Library, 1936, pp. vii, 140.) This compilation, which embraces more than 900 items, includes, in addition to what is indicated in the title, resolves of legislatures, provincial conventions, and committees of safety, and colonial ordinances adopted by governors and councils. It does not extend to any parts of America outside of territory which became the United States.

*A History of American Biography, 1800-1935.* By Edward H. O'Neill. (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1935, pp. xi, 428, $4.00.) This history of biographical writing in America is divided into three parts. The first covers the period from 1800 to 1918; the second, consisting of two chapters, deals with biographies of Lincoln and Washington; the third and longest is devoted to the postwar years. A bibliography of some fifty pages contains the titles mentioned in the text and some others. The chief value of the book, perhaps, lies in this list and in the convenient arrangement of titles in chronological sections. The author thinks that "the time has come to evaluate American biography for what it is worth". How well he discharges this formidable task may be judged from some of his descriptive phrases. One book is "complete in every respect" (p. 53). One author, "a genius in the art of biography", has "a method that is perfect and a style that is flawless" (p. 89). Of another book it is said: "In form and style, in method and execution, it conforms to every standard of biography and of literature" (p. 200). Of another "masterly combination of personal, political, and critical biography" Mr. O'Neill says: "This book approaches the ideal of life-writing as closely as any biography that I have ever read" (p. 225). Without reflecting in any way on the objects of this fulsome praise and without implying that there is no adverse criticism the reviewer can at least say that for mature judgments, couched in meaningful language, one must go elsewhere.

Dumas Malone.

*An Index and List of the Pamphlets and Periodicals collected by Rutherford Birchard Hayes.* (Columbus, The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1935, pp. 45.) The Hayes Memorial Library at Fremont, Ohio, possesses a vast collection of manuscripts, pamphlets, and periodicals. When the Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society, which manages the library for the state, published some years ago *The Diary and Letters of Rutherford Birchard Hayes,* this material was wholly unorganized, and the editor, Charles Richard Williams, had to spend countless hours in finding and assembling his data. The Rutherford B. Hayes and Lucy Webb Hayes Foundation, a private association, plans to aid in making the library one of the important centers of sources for the Reconstruction period. In order to render its stores of material more easily available to research workers, the foundation secured the services of Miss Ruth M. Boring, and the present publication is a first installment of the results of her labors. It includes a list of subjects dealt with in the 17,000 pamphlets in the library (not an index, as references to the pamphlets are not given) and lists of the library's periodicals of the Hayes period and after, pamphlets published in Ohio, and early and rare pamphlets.

*Papers relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1920.* Three volumes. [The Department of State.] (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1935; 1936; 1936, pp. xciv, 861; lxxxv, 895; xcvi, 823, $1.75 each.) The first category of these documents, comprising 370 pages, is labeled "General" and includes the papers relative to the aftermath of the Peace Conference, such as the Teschen dispute and Central European relief, the international financial conference at Brussels, the electrical communications conference, boundary disputes in Latin America of which Tacna-Arica was the most important. The succeeding documents are arranged by country in alphabetical order. The relative diplomatic importance of the various questions that arose during the year is roughly indicated by the amount of space given to each country. "China" occupies nearly half of the first volume, 406 pages, covering the civil war and protection of Americans, the organization of the new international financial consortium, the operation of railways, the Shantung problem. In the second volume the sections devoted to relations with Germany (342 pages) and Great Britain (103 pages) are of the first importance. In the third volume the most important sections are those devoted to Russia (291 pages), Mexico (230 pages), Turkey, Poland, and Japan. From such a mass of material it is difficult profitably to draw specific historical conclusions. But even a cursory survey reveals the very high relative importance to the United States of Far Eastern problems, the discretion with which the Mexican question was met, matched by the *naïveté* with which European political questions were handled. It is not without interest to note that even before the inauguration of the Harding administration the Department of State was chary of direct negotiations with the League of Nations. In August, 1920, Mr. Colby, endeavoring to secure repatriation of Americans from Russia through the good offices of Dr. Nansen, gave orders that our diplomats should deal with Nansen not as representative of the League but "as an agent of the International Red Cross". CHARLES SEYMOUR.

ARTICLES

JAMES BRYANT CONANT. The University Tradition in America—Yesterday and Tomorrow. *Educational Rec.*, Oct.

T. J. WERTENBAKER. The Founding of American Civilisation. *History*, Sept.

SIDNEY RATNER. Evolution and the Rise of the Scientific Spirit in America. *Philos. Sci.*, Jan.

ROY F. NICHOLS. *The Dictionary of American Biography. Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.

HENRY O. EVANS. Three Notable Collectors of Americana [John Carter Brown, Henry E. Huntington, William L. Clements]. *Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag.*, Sept.

PAUL LIETZ. Don Vasco de Quiroga, Sociologist of New Spain. *Mid-America*, Oct.

RAYMOND CORRIGAN. The Missions of New France: a Study in Motivation. *Ibid.*

HERBERT E. BOLTON. The Jesuits in America: an Opportunity for Historians. *Ibid.*

HENRY J. CADBURY. Intercolonial Solidarity of American Quakerism. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.

MICHAEL KRAUS. Eighteenth Century Humanitarianism: Collaboration between Europe and America. *Ibid.*, July.

MINNIE C. YARBOROUGH. John Horne Tooke: Champion of the American Colonists. *South Atlantic Quar.*, Oct.

Patrick Henry and the Present. *Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, Oct.

LOUIS H. RODDIS. A Partial List of Medical Men in the Maritime Service of the Colonies during the American Revolution. *Military Surgeon*, Nov.

WARRINGTON DAWSON. Les 2112 Français morts aux États-Unis de 1777 à 1783 en combattant pour l'indépendance américaine. *Jour. Soc. Am.*, 1936, no. 1.

JOHN HILL MORGAN. The Ramage Miniatures of George Washington. *New York Hist. Soc. Quar. Bull.*, Oct.

ROBERT P. REEDER. The First Homes of the Supreme Court of the United States. *Proc. Am. Philos. Soc.*, 1936, no. 4.

STEPHEN BLOORE. Miss Martineau Speaks Out. *New Eng. Quar.*, Sept.

RAY A. BILLINGTON. Maria Monk and her Influence. *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

PAUL M. ANGLE. Basic Lincolniana [cont.]. *Bull. Abraham Lincoln Assoc.*, Sept.

GLENN H. SEYMOUR. "Conservative"—Another Lincoln Pseudonym? *Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc.*, July.

AVERY CRAVEN. Coming of the War between the States: an Interpretation. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Aug.

ELI GINSBERG. The Economics of British Neutrality during the American Civil War. *Agricultural Hist.*, Oct.

FRED B. RYONS. The United States Army Medical Department, 1861 to 1865. *Military Surgeon*, Nov.

J. W. ELLISON. Adventures of an American Premier in Samoa, 1874-1876. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, Oct.

LESTER B. SHIPPEE. German-American Relations, 1890-1914: Review Article. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Dec.

NEWTON D. BAKER. Why We went to War. *For. Affairs*, Oct.

### DOCUMENTS

J. H. POWELL, ed. Some Unpublished Correspondence of John Adams and Richard Rush, 1811-1816. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.

JOHN PERRY PRITCHETT, ed. A Letter by Lord Selkirk on Trade between Red River and the United States. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, Dec.

JOHN B. RAE. Democrats and the Dorr Rebellion. *New Eng. Quar.*, Sept.

PHILIP G. AUCHAMPAUGH, ed. A Great Justice on State and Federal Power: Being the Thoughts of Chief Justice Taney on the Federal Conscription Act [an undelivered opinion]. *Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, Oct.

## NEW ENGLAND AND MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

*William Penn and the Dutch Quaker Migration to Pennsylvania.* By WILLIAM I. HULL. [Swarthmore College Monographs on Quaker History.] (Swarthmore, the College, 1935, pp. xiii, 445, $4.00.) In his second monograph in a proposed series of ten on Quaker history Professor Hull maintains the excellent standards of scholarship and research established in his first monograph entitled *William Sewel of Amsterdam, 1653-1720, the First Quaker Historian of Quakerism* (1934). Moreover he definitely proves to be erroneous the view, formerly accepted generally among historians, that Germantown was founded by German Mennonites. On the contrary, the founders of that settlement in 1683 were Dutch Quakers, and, therefore, the place "was in reality 'Dutch Town'" and not a German town, as the famous German historian of Germantown, Francis Daniel Pastorius, had made it appear. As a matter of fact, Pastorius was not the founder of Germantown in 1683 but only settled there in 1685, after his first attempt to bring over from the Continent bona fide Germans had failed. In using Penn's own account of his travels in Holland and Germany in 1677 as the primary source for three of the five chapters of the book, Professor Hull has also shown that while Penn "failed to bring many people on the Continent into the Quaker fold, he was extraordinarily successful in paving the way for a great exodus from it to the Promised Land beyond the Atlantic". Chapter IV of the book deals with the Dutch Quakers of Krefeld and Krisheim, both places being located within modern Germany but in the seventeenth century being under the rule of the house of Orange-Nassau and of the Elector of the Palatinate respectively. The final chapter (the fifth) recounts the experiences of the Dutch

pioneers on their journey from Krefeld and Krisheim to Pennsylvania and their subsequent settling at Germantown, just outside the limits of the then small town of Philadelphia. Five appendixes, seventeen illustrations, and an excellent index enhance the value of the work. GEORGE H. RYDEN.

ARTICLES

PRESERVED SMITH. A New England Family. *New Eng. Quar.*, Sept.

WILBUR H. SIEBERT. Underground Railroad in Massachusetts. *Ibid.*

EDWARD H. RAYMOND. The Fur-Seal Fishery and Salem. *Essex Inst. Hist. Coll.*, July.

JOHN A. KROUT. The Maine Law in New York Politics. *New York Hist.*, July.

JOHN O. BIGELOW. A Chapter in Chancery of New Jersey. *Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc.*, Oct.

MARTIN I. J. GRIFFIN. William Penn the Friend of Catholics. *Rec. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.*, Sept.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY. Thomas Cheyney, a Chester County Squire: His Lesson for Genealogists. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, July.

HERBERT W. K. FITZROY. The Punishment of Crime in Provincial Pennsylvania. *Ibid.*

BLANCHE MARIE. Catholic Church in Colonial Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania Hist.*, Oct.

JOSEPH J. MCCADDEN. Joseph Lancaster and the Philadelphia Schools. *Ibid.*

BOIES PENROSE. The Early Life of F. M. Drexel, 1792-1837. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.

ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER. Politics, Propaganda, and the Philadelphia Press, 1767-1837. *Ibid.*

BERNARD FAŸ. Early Party Machinery in the United States: Pennsylvania in the Election of 1796. *Ibid.*

ALFRED P. JAMES. Approaches to the Early History of Western Pennsylvania. *Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag.*, Sept.

DOCUMENTS

James Johns, Vermont Pen Printer [1797-1873]. *Proc. Vermont Hist. Soc.*, June.

Jacobus Van Cortlandt's Shipments from the Port of New York [calendars of bills of lading]. *New York Hist. Soc. Quar. Bull.*, Oct.

RANDOLPH G. ADAMS, ed. James Wilson: an Appreciation by James Bryce. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.

E. DOUGLAS BRANCH, ed. Plan for the Western Lands [letter of Dorsey Pentecost to James Wilson]. *Ibid.*, July.

## SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

ARTICLES

CLEMENT EATON. A Dangerous Pamphlet in the Old South. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Aug.

JOSEPH J. SPENGLER. Population Theory in the Ante-Bellum South. *Ibid.*

STANLEY GRAY. The British Navy and the Tobacco Trade of Virginia and Maryland. *U. S. Naval Inst. Proc.*, Sept.

PAUL H. GIDDENS. Governor Horatio Sharpe Retires. *Maryland Hist. Mag.*, Sept.

ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT. The Chevalier de la Luzerne and the Ratification of the Articles of Confederation by Maryland, 1780-1781, with Accompanying Documents. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.

E. G. SWEM. A Catalogue of the Portraits in the Library and in Other Buildings of William and Mary College. *Bull. College William and Mary*, Aug.

GEORGE C. GREGORY. Log Houses at Jamestown, 1607. *Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.

M. F. PLYLER. Family Traditions of Early Pioneers in Piedmont Carolina. *South Atlantic Quar.*, Oct.

NANNIE M. TILLEY. Industries of Colonial Granville County. *North Carolina Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

José Miguel Gallardo. The Spaniards and the English Settlement in Charles Town. *South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, Oct.

J. Randolph Anderson. The Spanish Era in Georgia History. *Georgia Hist. Quar.*, Sept.

D. C. Corbitt. The Contention over the Superintendencia of the Floridas [1812-1816]. *Florida Hist. Soc. Quar.*, Oct.

T. Frederick Davis. Engagements at St. Johns Bluff, St. Johns River, September-October, 1862. *Ibid.*

Maurice Ries. The Mississippi Fort, called Fort de la Boulaye, 1700-1715: the First French Settlement in Present-Day Louisiana. *Louisiana Hist. Quar.*, Oct.

Martin L. Riley. The Development of Education in Louisiana prior to Statehood. *Ibid.*, July.

Kathryn R. Schuler. Women in Public Affairs in Louisiana during Reconstruction. *Ibid.*

William A. Mabry. Louisiana Politics and the "Grandfather Clause". *North Carolina Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

Robert H. Williams, jr. Travis—a Potential Sam Houston. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Oct.

Madeline Meyercord. Oliver Loving, Pioneer Drover of Texas [1812-1867]. *Southwest Rev.*, Spring.

S. S. Robison. The Texas Navy. *U. S. Naval Inst. Proc.*, Sept.

William M. Robinson. The Sea Dogs of Texas. *Military Enquirer*, Nov.

### Documents

Walter Prichard, ed. L. Carroll Root: Experiences of a Federal Soldier in Louisiana in 1863. *Louisiana Hist. Quar.*, July.

Letters from Old Trunks [five letters of Mary Custis Lee, 1864-1866]. *Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.

Edwin A. Davis and John C. L. Andreassen, eds. From Louisville to New Orleans in 1816: Diary of William Newton Mercer. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Aug.

Alban W. Hoopes, ed. The Journal of George W. Barbour, May 1 to October 4, 1851 [cont.]. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Oct.

Henry M. Wagstaff, ed. Letters of Thomas Jackson Strayhorn [1863-1868]. *North Carolina Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

W. H. Bell, ed. Letter from Alexander Stephens to Dr. George W. Bagby [Apr. 12, 1870]. *William and Mary College Quar. Hist. Mag.*, July.

### Western Territories and States

*Guide to the Personal Papers in the Manuscript Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society.* Compiled by Grace Lee Nute and Gertrude W. Ackermann. (Saint Paul, Minnesota Historical Society, 1935, pp. x, 146, $1.25.) This compilation is described in the introduction as "a tool designed to aid students of Minnesota and American history" and "a systematic report to the world on the scope and value of one of the notable manuscript collections of the country". A descriptive note follows each of the 455 entries, and there is a very full index.

*A Bibliography of Minnesota Territorial Documents.* Compiled by Esther Jerabek. (Saint Paul, Minnesota Historical Society, 1936, pp. xvi, 157, $1.25.) This is a guide to the official documents of Minnesota Territory issued during the years 1849-1858, many of which are now very rare. A glance at the table of contents shows how the documents are organized, and there is an excellent, detailed index.

*Oklahoma Imprints, 1835-1907: a History of Printing in Oklahoma before Statehood.* By Carolyn Thomas Foreman. (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1936, pp. xxiv, 499, $5.00.) This book resembles my own *Bibliography of Maine Imprints to 1820* in one important respect: it stops just short of the period of statehood. In all other but minor matters it is different. The author's talent has

been released to happy effect for an excellent and entertaining account of printing in early Oklahoma. Comment on the period covered, the characters of the fourth estate who contributed to the establishment of printing in Indian Territory and Oklahoma, and the contents and history of newspapers, serials, and separate monographs, is amazingly full. The selection of portraits and facsimiles adds considerable interest to the work. A notable feature is the abundance of Indian titles. Chapters V to IX are entirely given over to newspapers of the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, Osage, Peoria, and Seminole nations. The first four chapters, also, covering the output of various mission presses, are perforce replete with material about and for the Indian. The last five chapters are exclusively and painstakingly devoted to the location, collation, and description of newspapers. Abundant biographical data are given for editors, publishers, and authors. The work compares favorably with Douglas McMurtrie's *Early Printing in Michigan*. The index is exceptionally detailed and full. The author has shown what devotion and interest can accomplish when they are joined to endow a chronicle with the breath of life. R. Webb Noyes.

*A History of the Labor Movement in California.* By Ira B. Cross. [University of California Publications.] (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1935, pp. xi, 354, $4.00.) The author's object in this monograph was to give the historical background of the present labor movement in California. The second half of the nineteenth century, when the movement was in its infancy, is the period of his detailed investigation. Only a few of the more notable events of the twentieth century have been mentioned.

Articles

Douglas C. McMurtrie. Notes on Printing in Kentucky in the Eighteenth Century. *Filson Club Hist. Quar.*, Oct.

Otto A. Rothert. The Tragedy of the Lewis Brothers. *Ibid.*

Powell Moore. The Revolt against Jackson in Tennessee, 1835-1836. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Aug.

Leslie E. Thal. History of Turtle Island in Lake Erie. *Hist. Soc. Northwestern Ohio Quar. Bull.*, Oct.

Temple Bodley. George Rogers Clark's Relief Claims. *Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc.*, July.

Helen Davault Williams. Social Life in St. Louis, 1840-1860. *Missouri. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

Walter B. Stevens. Political Turmoil of 1874 in Missouri. *Ibid.*

Lou B. Winsor. Masonry in Michigan. *Michigan Hist. Mag.*, Autumn.

Ralph Albertson. A Survey of Mutualistic Communities. *Iowa Jour. Hist. and Pol.*, Oct.

J. F. Swartzendruber. An Amish Migration [1851]. *Palimpsest*, Oct.

Bayrd Still. State-Making in Wisconsin, 1846-1848. *Wisconsin Mag. Hist.*, Sept.

Joseph Schafer. Stormy Days in Court: the Booth Case. *Ibid.*

Ralph L. Harmon. Ignatius Donnelly and his Faded Metropolis. *Minnesota Hist.*, Sept.

Lela Barnes. Journal of Isaac McCoy for the Exploring Expedition of 1828. *Kansas Hist. Quar.*, Aug.

Bayard H. Paine. Decisions which have changed Nebraska History. *Nebraska Hist. Mag.*, Oct.

Jesse D. Hale. The First Successful Smelter in Colorado. *Colorado Mag.*, Sept.

Eleanor L. Richie. The Disputed International Boundary in Colorado, 1803-1819. *Ibid.*

Elmer C. Sandmeyer. California Anti-Chinese Legislation and the Federal Courts: a Study in Federal Relations. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Sept.

Frederick C. Waite. The Medical Education of Marcus Whitman. *Oregon Hist. Quar.*, Sept.

O. Larsell. Whitman, "The Good Doctor". *Ibid.*

Robert J. Parker. William McGarrahan's "Panoche Grande Claim". *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Sept.

O. C. Upchurch. The Swinomish People and their State. *Pacific North West Quar.*, Oct.

DOCUMENTS

WILLIS C. WARD. Reminiscences of Michigan's Logging Days. *Michigan Hist. Mag.*, Autumn.

GRACE LEE NUTE. Father Skolla's Report on his Indian Missions. *Acta et Dicta*, Oct.

THOMAS C. WELLS. Letters of a Kansas Pioneer, 1855-1860 [cont.]. *Kansas Hist. Quar.*, Aug.

H. L. WEINGART, tr. Defense of Grand Island [letter of William Stolley, Sept. 10, 1864]. *Nebraska Hist. Mag.*, Oct., 1935; printed Oct., 1936.

J. MANUEL ESPINOSA, ed. The Opening of the First Jesuit Mission in Colorado: Conejos Parish [1871]. *Mid-America*, Oct.

HENRY R. WAGNER, ed. Journal of Tomás de Suría of his Voyage Malaspina to the Northwest Coast of America in 1791. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Sept.

## LATIN-AMERICAN HISTORY

*W. S. Robertson*

*La emancipación de Hispanoamérica.* By D. AMUNÁTEGUI SOLAR. (Santiago de Chile, Imprenta Universitaria, 1936, pp. 218.) A survey by a Chilean scholar of the movements that separated the Spanish-American colonies from the motherland.

*Libro de sesiones reservadas de la honorable junta representativa de la provincia de Buenos Aires 1822-1833 y libro de actas reservadas del congreso general constituyente 1824-1827 con una introducción sobre "Contribución al estudio de la Unión de las Provincias Litorales".* Edited by R. LEVENE. (La Plata, Taller de Impressiones Oficiales, 1936, pp. xii, 353.) This work is Volume VII of the publications of the historical archives of the province of Buenos Aires.

*O Reconhecimiento de Brasil pelos Estados Unidos de America.* By H. ACCIOLY (São Paulo, Companhia Editora Nacional, 1936, pp. 180.) A description of the recognition of the Brazilian Empire by the United States through the reception by President Monroe on May 26, 1824, of José Silvestre Rebello.

*Chile: Land and Society.* By GEORGE MCCUTCHEN MCBRIDE. (New York, American Geographical Society, 1936, pp. 408, $4.00.) A study which is largely devoted to Chilean agriculture.

*The Mexican Government in the Presence of Social and Economic Problems.* (Mexico, Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1936, pp. 38).

*Fuerza Transformadora de la Universidad Argentina.* By RICARDO LEVENE. (Buenos Aires, Editorial El Ateneo, 1936, pp. 306.) This book is composed largely of addresses delivered by Señor Ricardo Levene during the years when he was the president of the National University of La Plata.

*Migration of Industry to South America.* By D. M. PHELPS. (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1936, pp. 335, $4.00.) The founding by corporations in the United States of subsidaries in leading South American countries.

ARTICLES

E. M. BARBA. Algunos aspectos de política internacional durante el gobierno de Cevallos. *Humanidades*, 1936, no. 1.

J. BASADO. Una bibliografía de literatura peruana. *Bol. Bib. . . San Marcos*, June.

F. SCHWAB. Bibliografía de etnología peruana: II, Arqueología. *Ibid.*

Libros y folletos peruanos publicados en 1935. *Ibid.*

D. BELLEGARDE. Haiti and her Problems. *Univ. Puerto Rico Bull.*, Sept.

G. Arthur Gordon. The Arrival of the Scotch Highlanders at Darien. *Georgia Hist. Quar.*, Sept.

Alexander R. MacDonnell. The Settlement of the Scotch Highlanders at Darien. *Ibid.*

A. Andrade Coello. Maldonado y la misión geodésica. *Bol. Inst. Nac. Mejía*, May.

B. Ulécia Bernal. Hernando Colón y los intereses de los herederos del Almirante. *Tierra Firme*, I, no. 2.

Contribución á la historia de la prensa periódica. *Bol. Arch. Nac.* (Cuba), Jan.

C. Convers Fonnegra. Ciudades fundadas en Tierra Firme de 1505 á 1550: Cartagena. *Bol. Hist. y Antig.*, June.

L. Frías. La Compañía de Jesús suprimida en España hace un siglo. *Arch. Hist. Soc. Jesu*, July.

France V. Scholes. Church and State in New Mexico, 1610-1650 [cont.]. *New Mexico Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

E. de Gandia. La historia argentina y los historiadores españoles contemporáneos. *Am. Española*, Apr.

M. García-Pelayo. Ginés de Sepúlveda y los problemas jurídicos de la conquista de América. *Tierra Firme*, I, no. 2.

M. O. Hudson. The Inter-American Treaties of Pacific Settlement. *For. Affairs*, Oct.

G. Otero Muñoz. Ensayo sobre una bio-bibliografía colombiana. *Bol. Hist. y Antig.*, Aug.

A. Reulet Sánchez. Panorama de las ideas filosóficas en Hispanoamérica. *Tierra Firme*, II, no. 2.

C. E. Nowell. The Discovery of Brazil—Accidental or Intentional? *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, Aug.

J. M. Ots. La expansión del derecho español en las Indias. *Tierra Firme*, II, no. 1.

T. C. Mosquera. Resumen histórico del período de la última dictadura del Libertador. *Bol. Hist. y Antig.*, June.

G. Porras Troconis. Historia de Cartagena. *Am. Española*, Apr.

R. Rivarola *et al.* Encuestas de Nosotros: América y el destino de la civilización occidental. *Nosotros*, May.

A. Rosenblat. Los otomacos y taparitas de los llanos de Venezuela. *Tierra Firme*, II, no. 2.

I. Brant Schweide. La diplomacia de la Santa Alianza y la independencia hispanoamericana. *Ibid.*

C. M. Trelles. Sobre la prohibición del gobierno español á los jovenes cubanos de estudiar en los Estados Unidos de América y en Francia. *Bol. Arch. Nac.* (Cuba), Jan.

R. W. Van Alstyne. The Central American Policy of Lord Palmerstone, 1846-1848. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, Aug.

M. de Vedia y Mitre. Don Pedro de Mendoza, fundador de Buenos Aires. *Nosotros*, Sept.

J. R. Vejarano. La vida extraordinaria de Nariño. *Bol. Hist. y Antig.*, June.

A. R. Wright. The Origins of the Argentine Supreme Court. *World Affairs*, Sept.

J. M. Yepes. Le panaméricanisme au point de vue historique, juridique et politique. *Rev. Droit. Inter.*, July.

### Documents

A. R. de Carricarte. Documento desconocido de Martí. *Bol. Arch. Nac.* (Cuba), *Jan.*

Constitución de los Estados Unidos de Colombia, 1863. *Rev. Arch. Nac.* (Colombia). May.

L. Hanke. Baptis Irvine's Reports on Simón Bolívar. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, Aug.

# HISTORICAL NEWS

## AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The American Historical Association, with the co-operation of the National Council for the Social Studies, has established a new magazine, *Social Education,* of which Erling M. Hunt is editor and Katharine Elizabeth Crane assistant editor. The address of the editorial office is 204 Fayerweather Hall, Columbia University. *Social Education,* published through the American Book Company, New York City, is the journal of the National Council for the Social Studies. Persons not members of the council may subscribe through the editorial office or the publisher. The American Historical Association ceased to exercise editorial control of *Social Studies* with the December issue. It will be edited, as formerly, by the McKinley Publishing Company in Philadelphia.

The following should be added to the *List of Research Projects in History,* published as a supplement to Volume XXXIX, No. 3, of the *American Historical Review:*

XVIII. United States of America

(4) Foreign Affairs

The relations with Haiti, 1790-1936.
Prog. 400 pp. 1 yr.
Ludwell L. Montague, *Virginia Military Institute*

(8) Since 1782

Biography of Joshua R. Giddings.
Prog. Robert P. Ludlum, *Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas.*

(10) Middle Atlantic Colonies and States.

Biography of Conrad Weiser. Prog. 2 yrs. Paul A. W. Wallace, *Lebanon Valley College.*

A critical bibliography of Long Island. Prog. C. R. Hall, *Adelphi College.*

## OTHER HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: three volumes of records of Fairfax County, Virginia, 1742-1773; five letters from Thomas Pinckney to Rufus King, 1796; papers of the duel of Henry Clay and John Randolph; typewritten copy of an account of travels in the western United States, 1826-1840, by Joseph W. Spaulding; 113 letters, 1839-1880, and many early papers of Schuyler Colfax; memorandum of Daniel Webster regarding Tyler's veto of the Bank Bill, 1841; papers of Nathaniel Wright; papers of Simon Cameron, many hundreds; diary of Edwin F. Ludwig, jr., Charleston, S. C.,

1861; papers of Alfred T. Mahan; notes of N. W. Stephenson respecting Nelson W. Aldrich; additional papers of Brand Whitlock and Henry T. Rainey; additional photostats from the London Public Record Office.

The Library of the American Philosophical Society has recently come into possession of a collection of Franklin papers, numbering approximately 1100. It was acquired by purchase from Mrs. Franklin Bache and consists of letters to and from Franklin, many of them of importance for financial and diplomatic history. A description of these manuscripts will be published next spring.

The Josiah Harmar Papers have recently been acquired by the William L. Clements Library. This important collection includes some 3500 manuscripts embracing the period of Samuel Harmar's service with the Continental army, his trip to Paris in connection with the ratification of the peace treaty, his command of the "Old Northwest Territory" (1784-1791), and his adjutant generalship of the Pennsylvania militia (1791-1799). It contains military and family papers and records relating to business and real estate, especially the western military lands.

To the Parrish Collection of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania have been added a number of manuscript collections including 130 papers of the Pemberton family, letters of the Barclay family, and various manuscripts relating to the Parrish family. Among these last are Ann Parrish's casebook recording her "Visitations of the Sick" in 1796; Dillwyn Parrish's "Memoirs of the Parrish Family" (1841); a notebook of Samuel Parrish; and a manuscript in his hand transcribing some of Dr. Joseph Parrish's writings on capital punishment and other matters. In a group of documents relating to the Society of Friends there are records of the Friends' Meetings in America (1676-1771) and other interesting materials. There have been acquired also the journal of Jacob Kern's journey from Reading to the Forks of the Delaware in 1758; a photostat copy of Conrad Weiser's journal of his expedition to Ohio in 1748; "The Force of Nature or the Errors of Concealment, a Tragedy in Five Acts", an apparently unpublished play by James Fennell; a deed dated July 10, 1680 (antedating other Penn deeds by about two years), for the greater part of the present county of New Castle, Delaware; and a petition (April, 1744) from a group of Irish settlers on Spring Manor in Chester County, Pennsylvania, to Lieutenant Governor George Thomas.

Recent accessions of manuscripts to the Columbiana Collection in the Low Memorial Library at Columbia University include the following: the detailed journals of the Reverend John Barent Johnson (1769-1803; Columbia, 1792), covering his school and college days in New York City and his life as a Dutch Reformed minister in Albany and Brooklyn; the correspondence of Cyrus King (1772-1817; Columbia, 1791), half brother of Rufus King, a lawyer and representative in Congress from Saco, 1813-1817,

correspondence containing interesting material on Federalist politics in Maine; the correspondence of Peter Dumont Vroom (1791-1873; Columbia, 1808), covering his public career as governor of New Jersey, representative in Congress, and minister to Prussia, and his law practice in Trenton; a large collection of letters and papers of John William Burgess (1844-1931; Amherst, 1867), professor of political science at Columbia, 1876-1912, and first Theodore Roosevelt Professor at the University of Berlin, 1906-1907. The Archives of Columbia University, consisting of the extant correspondence, reports, and papers of the presidents and trustees and including the contents of a large chest of pre-Revolutionary papers discovered in 1932, are being classified, bound, and indexed, and will be available for use in the near future.

During the past year the University of Virginia Library has made some important additions to its manuscript and newspaper collections. Among these may be mentioned: an original map of the Virginia-North Carolina boundary, probably drawn by Peter Jefferson about 1750; two letters of Thomas Jefferson to Philip L. Grymes, 1800 and 1802; manuscripts of the Morris family of Hanover and Louisa counties, consisting chiefly of letters received by three generations of this family (including a few from Henry Clay) dealing with business, politics, and general social conditions during the period 1770-1900; photographic copies of a four-volume manuscript diary of Captain Philip Slaughter (a commentary on farm life and business in Culpeper County with remarks on political and social events from 1796 to 1848) and of letters and documents of Sir William Berkeley, 1661-1690, in the British Public Record Office; a bound photostatic set of the Williamsburg *Virginia Gazette*, 1736-1780; and a number of rare issues of Richmond newspapers.

Accessions to the manuscripts in the Wisconsin State Historical Library include: a collection of letters depicting student life at West Point written to Richard E. Ela of Lebanon, New Hampshire, during the years 1830-1837; the earliest letter books of Wisconsin's territorial governors (transferred from the archives of the executive department at the state capitol); the correspondence, articles, and addresses of Lorenzo Dow Harvey, well-known Wisconsin educator; and papers relating to land speculation in Nebraska in the 1880's in the William P. Gundry collection recently presented to the library.

The most important recent addition to the manuscripts of the Minnesota Historical Society is a collection of the papers of John Lind, governor of Minnesota from 1899 to 1901, representative in Congress from 1887 to 1893 and from 1903 to 1905, and special agent of President Wilson in Mexico in 1913. In addition to important material on Lind's political career the papers contain, in his official dispatches and correspondence, valuable information about political conditions in Mexico just before the outbreak of the World

War and about relations between Mexico and the United States. A description of the Lind Papers was published in *Minnesota History*, XVII (June, 1936), 159-165.

The University of Chicago Libraries invite scholars to utilize their Lincoln Historical Collection. The nucleus of the collection is the late William E. Barton's Lincolniana, acquired by the university in the spring of 1934. It is one of the five large collections of Lincoln material in the country, the others being at the Library of Congress, Brown University, Huntington Library, and the Lincoln National Life Insurance Company at Fort Wayne, Indiana. Since October 1, 1936, the collection has been headed by Miss Muriel Bernitt of the University of Chicago Libraries and formerly connected with the Burton Historical Collection at Detroit.

History figured prominently on the program of the Harvard Tercentenary Conference of Arts and Sciences held last September. Three of the five symposia in which the conference was organized had to do with man and society, the others being devoted to the physical and biological sciences. The former dealt with broad subjects which could be approached from the standpoints of different disciplines, namely, Factors determining Human Behavior, Authority and the Individual, and Independence, Convergence, and Borrowing in Institutions, Thought, and Art. Under these comprehensive topics some forty papers were presented by physiologists, psychologists, archaeologists, philologists, economists, sociologists, jurists, philosophers, and historians. No brief notice could indicate, even summarily, the wealth of reflection and suggestion which they contain, far less do justice to it. Fortunately, these papers are to be published in the very near future by the Harvard University Press. Several of them were written by professional historians, and many of the others were historical in character. For example, a professor of music, Edward Joseph Dent of Cambridge University, discoursed suggestively on "The Historical Approach to Music"; a prehistoric archaeologist, Professor Vere Gordon Childe of the University of Edinburgh, offered "A Prehistorian's Interpretation of Diffusion"; and a sociologist and political philosopher, Professor Robert M. MacIver of Columbia University, in a paper on "The Historical Pattern of Social Change", examined critically the conception of societies and civilizations as organisms and presented an alternative theory of historical development.

Three of the historians who took part in the conference are former presidents of the American Historical Association. Professor Charles McLean Andrews's subject was "Conservative Factors in Early Colonial History". Addressing himself to the question of when English America ceased to be English and became American, he took occasion to warn against the attitude of present mindedness that has led historians as well as laymen to carry the beginnings of our democracy much too far back and to make its progress far too simple and rapid. In words reminiscent of some dicta of

Maitland's he emphasized the need, in the study of our colonial history, of banishing from the mind, as far as possible, such anachronizing ideas as democracy, rugged individualism, manifest destiny, etc. If this is done with measurable success, it will be seen, he believes, that conservative, and even ultra-conservative, factors predominated in seventeenth century English America. Protests and grievances there were, to be sure, but they ought not to be interpreted as democratic or progressive in character. Those who voiced them were Englishmen, struggling for the rights and privileges of Englishmen, and it was not until well into the eighteenth century that ideas took shape in the colonial mind that can properly be called American in any other than a geographical sense. The seventeenth century of our colonial history contributed little or nothing, in Andrews's judgment, to the advancement of those ideals that are today regarded as typically American. Professor Michael I. Rostovtzeff took as his theme, in the symposium on Independence, Convergence and Borrowing, "Parthian Art and the Motive of the Flying Gallop". He traced the history of this motive, which is the artistic representation of a running animal as if it were flying, with all four legs raised from the ground and extended parallel with the body, from what seems to have been its origin in the art of Crete and Mycenae, showing how it reappeared, at much later periods, in different areas, notably the Iranian and the Chinese. Is this history to be explained as an example of borrowing or of independent origins? Rostovtzeff leans to the second hypothesis. Henry Osborn Taylor's "Placing the Middle Ages" was a mature and mellow discourse, such as would be expected from the author of *The Medieval Mind*. It was a discussion, by means of suggestive illustration, of some of the formative antecedents of medievalism, the manner in which they were molded in the Middle Ages, and how the Middle Ages contributed to the store of human values. "Through the labor of making their inheritance their own, the Middle Ages produced whatever of lasting value it was their fortune to hand on. No period of history shows more clearly how little of what goes before is lost in the most signal creations of the human spirit."

The annual meeting of the New York State Historical Association was held jointly with a meeting of the Ontario Historical Society at Niagara Falls on September 14-16. A full account of the proceedings will be published in an early issue of the association's quarterly journal, *New York History*.

On November 13-14 the Pennsylvania Historical Association held its annual meeting at Reading. The following officers were elected: president, Roy F. Nichols (University of Pennsylvania); vice-president, J. Bennet Nolan of Reading; secretary, J. Paul Selsam (Pennsylvania State College); treasurer, Ross P. Wright of Erie. The association is making plans for a publication series in the near future. Arthur C. Bining (University of Pennsylvania) is editor of *Pennsylvania History*, the quarterly journal of the association.

The youthful Southern Historical Association, upon the invitation of Vanderbilt University, George Peabody College, and Scarritt College, held its second annual meeting at Nashville on November 19-21. There was a registration of more than 150. Sessions were held on the South in the American Revolution, the Agrarian South, Europe and the South, and Tennessee History. The following officers were elected: president, T. P. Abernethy (University of Virginia); vice-president, Charles S. Sydnor (Duke University); secretary-treasurer, Fletcher M. Green (University of North Carolina).

In connection with the notice regarding the change in editorship of the *Historische Zeitschrift*, published in our last issue, it is interesting to note that the German government has effected the amalgamation with the *Historische Zeitschrift* of the *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*. The latter journal was, next to the *Historische Zeitschrift*, the leading historical journal in Germany. It was the successor to the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, begun by Ludwig Quidde in 1879. In 1898 Gerhard Seeliger became its editor, and in 1922 he was succeeded by Erich Brandenburg. This journal served as the focal point for the Leipzig historians and generally reflected the outlook of the German National Liberals. In its pages were published many of the important studies of such historians as Karl Lamprecht, Georg von Below, Ernst Bernheim, and Erich Brandenburg.

The past year has witnessed the disappearance of the most distinguished learned society in Germany devoted to the social sciences, the Verein für Sozialpolitik. At a meeting held on April 25, 1936 (news of the meeting was not made public until September) the membership voted to dissolve the Verein and make way for a new organization to take its place. It found that it could not accept the demands imposed upon it by the Ministry of Education and maintain, at the same time, the intellectual independence and freedom of action which the organization owed to its members. The Verein für Sozialpolitik was organized at a conference in Eisenach in 1872 by Gustav Schmoller, Adolph Wagner, Lujo Brentano, Gustav von Schönberg, and others. Its first president was Rudolf Gneist, and he was succeeded by Gustav Schmoller, who acted as its head from 1890 to 1917. The immediate aim of the society was to spread the doctrines of the "socialists of the chair" and influence social legislation along these lines. Later, however, it became almost exclusively an organization for scientific research. In its *Schriften*, of which 187 volumes have been published, are found some of the outstanding German contributions to social and economic history. Among the more significant research projects carried out by the Verein were the investigations into German agricultural labor, carried on by Max Weber, and the series of over forty monographs on hand workers in Germany, directed by Karl Bücher.

The distinguished Italian economist and historian, Senator Luigi Einaudi,

is the founder and editor of a quarterly, *Rivista di Storia Economica,* the first number of which was published in March by the Giulio Einaudi firm of Turin.

Announcement has been made of the formation of an International Council of scholars associated with the program of the New Florentine Collection, which was founded in 1931 in Florence, for the purpose of making available to scholars in appropriate publications the remarkable documentary treasures, for the most part inaccessible until then, which had been discovered in the private archives of Florence. The New Florentine Collection now has in hand valuable unpublished material for several volumes. Its general chairman and administrator is Dr. P. H. Harris of Harvard University.

Tomes III-IV of the *Revue internationale des études balkaniques* have recently appeared. This journal was established more than a year ago by the Institut balkanique, itself only recently organized through the efforts of more than two hundred scholars interested in Balkan and Near Eastern studies. The work of the institute is not merely a contribution to scholarly and intellectual collaboration in the Balkan peninsula, important though that is, but it is a work that points the way toward a broader co-operation among the leaders of the Balkan people.

The Women's Organization for National Prohibition Reform has established a fellowship open to women graduates of colleges on the accepted list approved by the Association of American Universities who have received the bachelor's degree not earlier than June, 1931, and have shown special ability in history, economics, government, or social science. The fellowship will be awarded annually by the Faculty of Barnard College. Application forms may be secured from the chairman of the committee in charge of the fellowship, Professor Thomas P. Peardon of Barnard, and applications must reach the committee not later than March 1.

The Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America has announced that its Twelfth Seminar in Mexico, which will be led by a distinguished group of authorities on Pan-American affairs, will be held next July and that it will conduct in January and February a two weeks' seminar in Guatemala on similar lines. It has announced also that a Mid-Winter Institute will be held in Mexico in February, with a program of lectures, round tables, and field trips.

Students of Mexican history may be interested to know that Mr. Kip Ross, Luis Moya, 44, Dept. 14, Mexico, D. F., is prepared to make photographic copies of documents in the Archivas Nacionales and the Biblioteca Nacional.

## PERSONAL

Edwin A. Grosvenor died at Amherst on September 15 at the ripe age of ninety-one. After graduation from Amherst in 1867 he taught history at Robert College, first as instructor and later as professor. After his return to the United States in 1890 he joined the faculty of Amherst and remained an active member of it until his retirement as professor emeritus in 1914, occupying successively the chairs of European History and Modern Government. He was a prolific writer on historical and political subjects. He is said to have contributed more than three hundred articles to encyclopedias. His most important work was a two-volume historical and descriptive account of Constantinople, published in 1895.

On September 15 Darwin O. Clark, professor of history at Monmouth College since 1921, died at the age of 65. A graduate of Drury College with the class of 1896, he pursued graduate studies at the University of Illinois, receiving the Ph.D. in 1921. He served as professor of history at Illinois College and at Carroll College. In recent years he concentrated his teaching in the fields of contemporary history and methods of research.

In the obituary paragraphs of the *American Historical Review* the death of Mr. George P. Brett, chairman of the board of the Macmillan Company, on September 18, should not pass without notice, for it may truly be said that no professional historical scholar did more than he for the founding and early maintenance of the *Review*. With great interest and appreciation he considered the plans for its establishment, and to the counsels of the board by which an enterprise so novel in the United States had been undertaken he contributed experience, good judgment, and wisdom. In addition to the substantial pecuniary support which, upon its foundation, he assigned to the enterprise, assistance that has ever since been maintained, he aided its progress throughout the years with sagacity and cordial interest. His connection with the American branch of Macmillan and Company began in 1874, when he was but fifteen. In 1890 he succeeded his father as resident managing partner in charge of that branch. In 1896 he became president of the Macmillan Company, then constituted as a separate organization, and remained its president until 1931, when he became chairman of its board. For many years Mr. Brett was one of the foremost figures in the world of American publishing.

Allen Brown West, professor of ancient history at the University of Cincinnati and a frequent contributor to this journal, met his death at the age of fifty as the result of an automobile accident on September 18. After graduating from Milton College in 1907, Dr. West was Rhodes Scholar from Wisconsin at Oriel College, Oxford University, 1907-1909 and 1910-1911. He took his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees at the University of Wisconsin and

began his teaching career in 1912 at Swarthmore College. Varied experience led him eventually to Princeton and finally, in 1927, to Cincinnati. Dr. West's authority was recognized in many fields of ancient history, and he made important contributions to Greek and Latin epigraphy, chronology, numismatics, and geography. In recent years his major interest was the financial records of fifth century Athens and particularly the tribute quota-lists of the Athenian Empire. He collaborated with Professor Meritt in the preparation of the standard text of the Athenian quota-lists, published in the *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum V* (1930), while the *Athenian Assessment of 425 B.C.*, published in 1934 by the same authors, is a monument of meticulously accurate editing and scrupulous argumentation. In the field of numismatics Professor West is best known for his *Fifth and Fourth Century Gold Coins from the Thracian Coast*, a technical monograph which won the praise of critics for the industry and learning which it revealed.

After a long illness Oliver Huntingdon Richardson, professor emeritus of history in the University of Washington, died at Seattle on September 22. Born in Providence on December 10, 1866, he attended Yale, receiving the bachelor's degree in 1889. For a year he served as instructor in history and political economy in Colorado Springs and then spent two years studying in Europe, especially in Italy, France, and Germany. From 1892 to 1897 he was professor of history in Drury College, Springfield, Missouri, but was given a leave of absence in 1895 to continue his studies in Germany and in 1897 received the doctorate at the University of Heidelberg. He was thereupon appointed assistant professor of history at Yale, where he remained until 1909, when he went to the University of Washington. He was made professor emerituts in 1930. Professor Richardson was the author of *The National Movement in the Reign of Henry III and its Culmination in the Barons' War* (1897) and he contributed numerous articles and reviews to learned journals. He served as president of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association in 1925 and 1926. He was deeply interested in the historical antecedents of the World War, on which he gave many lectures, and he took an active part in the Washington State Council of Defense. His students will cherish his memory, and his colleagues and friends outside the classroom will remember him as a kindly and esteemed associate.

The history of Princeton was the special interest of Varnum Lansing Collins, who died on October 9 in his sixty-sixth year. He had served Princeton, his alma mater, continuously from 1896, as reference librarian, instructor, professor, secretary, and historiographer. His two-volume biography of President Witherspoon is his most important historical work.

Mrs. Annie Russell Marble died at her home in Worcester, Massachusetts, on November 23. She wrote a large number of biographies, the latest of which, *From 'Prentice to Patron: the Life Story of Isaiah Thomas*, was published in 1935 and is reviewed in the present issue of this journal.

As a historian Charles Sanford Terry, who died in Scotland on November 5 at the age of seventy-two, did first-rate work in two fields, in both of which he was a prolific writer. Though born in England, he became interested early in life in the history of Scotland. He was appointed lecturer in history at Aberdeen University in 1899 and professor in 1903. Several of his books deal with the Jacobite movement. His *History of Scotland from the Roman Evacuation to the Disruption, 1843* is a scholarly compendious work. The other field that Professor Terry cultivated intensively and enthusiastically was the history of music. His life of Bach was acclaimed by critics as an admirable biography. In 1930 he lectured on Bach in the United States, and he was an honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

The distinguished political scientist and historian, Joseph Redlich, died at Vienna on November 11. His most important work was in the fields of law and government. His *Recht und Technik des englischen Parlarmentarismus,* which has long been a standard treatise, is a systematic history of procedure in the House of Commons. His *Das österreichische Staats- und Reichsproblem* is an important historical study of the internal politics and public law of Austria. *Österreichische Regierung und Verwaltung im Weltkrieg* (translated into English as *Austrian War Government*) is one of the volumes in the Carnegie Endowment's Economic and Social History of the World War. *Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria* is a very readable biography, written with insight and sympathy. Dr. Redlich was professor emeritus of Comparative Law at Harvard and a member of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Agnes Christina Laut, who died on November 15, was attracted early in life to the history of exploration and the fur trade and wrote many volumes on those subjects. Born in Ontario, she went out to Winnipeg with her parents when she was a child. After attending the University of Manitoba she became a journalist and was well known as a newspaper correspondent and writer of articles and short stories. Several of her books—*Lords of the North, The Conquest of the Great Northwest,* and *Adventures of England on Hudson Bay*—are concerned with the history of the Hudson's Bay Company. Miss Laut's historical writing was in somewhat popular vein, but much of it has substantial merit.

Albrecht Mendelssohn Bartholdy, the eminent German authority in the fields of comparative and international law and formerly professor in Leipzig and Würzburg, died at Oxford on November 27 at the age of 63. He was appointed a member of the German Peace Delegation in 1919, and while at Versailles he was entrusted with the task of publishing the documents from German archives relating to the origins of the war. From 1920 until 1926 he devoted himself largely to the organization of material for *Die Grosse Politik,* in conjunction with Friederich Thimme, who supervised technical details. Mendelssohn Bartholdy himself took particular interest in the chap-

ters dealing with Great Britain, the United States, and The Hague conferences. In 1920 he founded the Institute of International Affairs in Hamburg, the first of its kind in Germany. He was responsible for the establishment and the tone of the institute's journal, *Europäische Gespräche,* which attracted notable contributions in the field of diplomatic history. In 1933 he resigned his position in Hamburg to become Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, where he spent his last three years. He was deeply interested in bringing German, English, and American scholars into close co-operative effort and intellectual understanding. This distinguished grandson of the composer won the admiration and affection of students all over the world by his liberal convictions, his courage, and his humanistic longing to achieve the truth and to express it in lucid and graceful statement. His services to students of recent diplomatic history cannot be exaggerated.

Too other German historians have died recently: Jacob Strieder, professor at Munich, who wrote on the origin of capitalism and on travels in the Levant of German merchants of the sixteenth century; and Friedrich Keutgen, professor at Hamburg, who concerned himself with medieval town organization, and the Hansa and England in the fourteenth century.

Last October Dr. William E. Lingelbach opened the series of lectures to be given during the year at Ohio University by distinguished visiting scholars. He spoke on "The New Era", "American Democracy and Its European Interpreters", and "Democracy and the Control of Foreign Affairs".

Henry E. Pratt, formerly assistant professor of history at Illinois Wesleyan University, who has done considerable research on the life of Abraham Lincoln, has been appointed secretary of the Abraham Lincoln Association, Springfield, Ill. This position was formerly held by Dr. Benjamin P. Thomas, who resigned to go into business. Dr. Edwin H. Cates went from Upper Iowa College to take the position at Illinois Wesleyan vacated by Professor Pratt.